



**DELHI UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY**

**DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY**

Cl No. **V2:25x M69d** **HI**

Ac No. **205305**

Date of release for loan

**12 OCT 1964**

This book should be returned on or before the date stamped below. An overdue charge of 0.5 nP will be charged for each day the book is kept overtime.

---



# GANDHI-MUSLIM CONSPIRACY

BY  
A HINDU NATIONALIST

Deeds will be done, - while he boasts his quiescence,  
Still bidding crouch whom the rest bade aspire :  
Blot out his name, then, record one lost soul more,  
One task more declined, one more footpath untrod.

—“ *Lost Leader* ” R. Browning.

Foreword By  
Barr. Jamnadas M. Mehta,  
Ex-finance Minister, Bombay.

Publishers :  
R. D. Ghanekar,  
323, Main Street, Poona.

1941



*All rights reserved by the publishers. ]*

*Printed by Mr. V. G. Ketkar, at the Lokasangraha Press,  
624 Sadashiv Peth, Poona 2 and Published by Mr. R. D. Ghanekar,  
323, Main Street, Poona 1.*

## FOREWORD

---

THIS BOOK is a sustained attempt to show that there was in 1920-21 a definite conspiracy to invite the Amir of Afghanistan to invade this country and that Gandhiji and the Ali Brothers were the leaders of that conspiracy, that this conspiracy to establish Muslim Raj in India or at any rate, the mentality behind it still continues, that this fact is conclusively established by Gandhiji's article in the "Harijan" dated the 13th October 1940, that Gandhiji in spite of his absolute sincerity and his undoubted patriotism is the victim of a cruel hallucination which makes him believe, that he is the prophet of a New Age, born to shape erring humanity into the pattern of Truth and Non-violence, that Providence has specially commissioned him to achieve that consummation; that this unconscious, cruel but none the less real self-deception results in making the Mahatma an incorrigible egotist and in creating in his heart an irrepressible craving for a domination over men's minds reckless of consequences and that by this insatiable though unconscious lust for domination he has brought into existence an absolute stalemate in Indian politics, a communal tension in the worst and the most aggravated form, an accentuation of the slave mentality in the masses, a virtual collapse of the intelligentsia and a tightening of foreign fetters round India's feet; but with all that he has achieved his object. Gandhiji is to-day for millions the Mahatma a MESSIAH, a Prophet, the Herald of a New Age and that is what he wanted.

2. The author makes no secret that he is fully convinced of the conspiracy between the Ali Brothers and the Mahatma. This conspiracy, according to the author, was inspired by the excessive religious zeal of the Ali Brothers and it was also the result of the absurd lengths to which the Mahatma was prepared to go in order to purchase, if he could, the support of the Muslims in the pursuit of his role of a phantom Prophetship. The evidence that the author has collected in support of this

conviction is varied. It is largely documented. It is marshalled from the speeches, articles and actions of the main conspirators and of independent onlookers. The full significance of this evidence was not noticed in the years 1920-21; or rather the Afghan intrigue was considered so patriotic during the political excitement of those days that the menace to India's freedom involved therein was ignored. But the evidence challenges attention. Any attempt to brush it aside will be a fatal error.

3. The ardent devotees of the Mahatma will be shocked by the contents of this book. They will very likely raise their hands in horror at the 'impudence' of the writer and probably worse of the writer of this Foreword. They will consider this publication a sacrilege, profane beyond conception. To their believing minds nothing will appear more impossible, nothing more false or malicious than to attribute such conduct to the Mahatma. To charge the "Apostle of the New Age" with the heinous crime of treachery to his own country and especially to the followers of his own professed Faith, would appear to them to be the work of malice or perversity or both. Even the detached reader will be inclined to be sceptical. But the book is not to be dismissed in such supercilious fashion.

4. It should of course be obvious that the Mahatma cannot be consciously guilty of any such crime against his country, that Gandhiji, the champion of Truth and Non-violence, the one Indian who stood up to the racial arrogance of the Africander, who has raised the moral stature of the Indian people since 1920-21 by exhorting them to be courageous at the cost of their lives, who first taught India the apparently formidable but really futile weapon of resistance to the mighty British Empire in the form of Civil Disobedience—is it even conceivable, millions will ask, that such a superman could have perpetrated a foul act of treachery to his country and its people?

\*5. And yet there is little doubt that such apparent contradictions are perfectly compatible. Leaders of any movement with the spirit of crusaders in them are quite frequently men of unusual disinterestedness. They will be prepared,

*\*With acknowledgments to Bertrand Russell (Vide his book 'Roads to Freedom').*

in pursuit of their ideals to suffer untold hardships and to rise to unparalleled heights of sacrifice. Wealth, reputation and exalted careers could be at their feet, but they will disdain them for the cause. Whatever errors occur in the details in their personal lives they are, where the cause is concerned, as clear as crystal. These pioneers, for the best part of their lives, experience prison and exile which they deliberately invite. By example and precept they show to the world that the hope which inspired their conduct was not for themselves but for mankind. Such undoubtedly is the Mahatma.

\*6. Nevertheless though the desire for human welfare is what determines the broad lines of the action of such men, their method of work once formed becomes wooden and it makes them dogmatic, intolerant and even fanatical. They become embittered by the opposition and disappointments which they encounter in their endeavour to bring happiness to the world. The more certain they are of the purity of their motives and the truth of their gospel, the more indignant will they become when their preaching is rejected or opposed. Often, they will successfully achieve an attitude of philosophic tolerance as regards apathy of the masses and even as regards the wholehearted opposition of professed defenders of the status quo. But the men whom they find it impossible to forgive are those who profess the same desire for amelioration of society as they feel themselves and yet do not accept their method of achieving better. The intense faith which enables them to withstand prosecution for the sake of their belief makes them consider these beliefs to be so luminously obvious that any thinking men who reject them must be dishonest and actuated by some sinister motive of treachery to the cause. Hence arises that spirit of the sect, that bitter, narrow, orthodoxy amongst these leaders of mankind. The personal ambition which they ruthlessly mortify and suppress in the choice of their career is reborn in another form. It returns to them in a conviction of their infallibility. The men who have sacrificed most for the benefit of mankind appear to be actuated by an implacable hatred of

---

\*With acknowledgments to *Bertrand Russell* (Vide his book 'Roads to Freedom').

the opponent and by a determination for intellectual domination; while preaching freedom of thought they insist on a conformity which stifles free exercise of thought. Those who have begun with a determination to fight for freedom end by becoming themselves despotic. The ambition for wealth, power and authority so carefully smothered and suppressed and an intense desire for the freedom of the country so religiously cherished by the Mahatma, have brought about a subtle and insidious hallucination in him that he is the modern MESSIAH, that Nature and Providence have commissioned him to be so and that those who do not accept his mission must be condemned as faithless and must therefore be destroyed. The Mahatma has brought to bear on his mission a new and characteristic strategy. He has been able successfully to conceal his hatred and prejudices against his opponents under the lofty poses of Love, Truth and Non-violence and by the amazing gentleness of his language towards them. This ostentatious deference to his adversaries serves his purpose and often turns the adversary into an ardent admirer. But the whole strategy is a mask, unconscious but a mask still. The method of defeating the adversary is deadly in its precision. And all this is superimposed by a spectacular austerity of life. The result is not in doubt. The trick is done. The magic tells. The adversary is duped and the conjuror carries the day. Mr. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi becomes the Mahatma.

7. To penetrate behind this veil of saintliness which conceals a relentless purpose requires no small degree of patient research and courage. The author possesses both these; he has come forward to tear the mask with a resolute will that will not be diverted of its purpose.

8. In 1914, after his abortive attempt in London to help the British Government in the last world war, and having already before that time said farewell to South Africa, the Mahatma returned to India with the hallucination that he was destined to become a Prophet. He started his mission with the determination to destroy all who stood in his way always under the guise of the most high sounding doctrines. It will be remembered that he began by professing to be an humble follower of the

late Mr. Gokhale and thus insinuated himself with the Liberals so successfully that many of them began to believe that whatever the faults of the Mahatma he was at least honest and that he was therefore to be preferred to the Tilakite school whose methods both the Liberals and the Mahatma considered to be not free from blame. By thus ingratiating himself in their favour he destroyed the Liberal Party in the course of a few years. So subtle was the process that some of the followers of the late Mr. Gokhale were apt to regard the Mahatma to be an unofficial member of the Servants of India Society. I wonder whether they do so now. I do not wish to speculate what the late Mr. Gokhale himself would have thought, if he could come to life again, of a follower who has destroyed the old Indian National Congress of 1885 and in its place has set up a dictatorship with its monstrosities of "*the blank cheque*" and "*neither support nor oppose*" theories. Everybody knows that the Liberal Party has become today the shadow of its former self, if it is not wholly destroyed, largely through the Mahatma.

9. He next professed an intense admiration for the late Lokmanya Tilak and although he found it difficult to swallow the latter in the beginning, he persisted in his efforts in his own subtle manner and expressed the highest regard for the intellectual supremacy of the late Lokmanya, thereby suggesting that the ethical argument was on the Mahatma's side. A lofty moral pose proclaimed from the house-top, although honoured more in the breach than in observance, struck the unwary into mute admiration and weakened the opponent. So long as Lokmanya was alive, the Mahatma preferred on the whole to lie low, but nevertheless went on with his clever game of mud-throwing against that great man. Unhappily in 1920, Lokmanya Tilak died and the Mahatma got the chance of a life-time. He paid the most flattering compliments to the memory of Lokmanya Tilak, started what is called the Tilak Swarajya Fund and collected a crore of rupees in order ostensibly to perpetuate his memory but really to destroy it. It is common knowledge that every single one of this crore of rupees was spent in artfully discrediting and treacherously stabbing Lokmanya Tilak's

philosophy. With that sum, he created vested interests for his so-called philosophy of faith against reason. When the Mahatma cannot subdue, he cajoles and coaxes until his victims themselves get trapped by his strategy. Rabindranath Tagore, Shastri, Sapru, Malaviyaji, Radhakrishnan and many more are the victims of this strategy. When coaxing fails, he would stoop still further to conquer and appear to yield as he did in the case of Deshbandhu Das and Motilal Nehru, both of whom he ultimately swallowed. Those who still survive his tactics, he follows with the implacable love of the Mahatmic type, as in the case of the whole of the Tilakite school, Mrs. Beasant, Messrs. Vithalbhai Patel, Nariman, Khare, Bose, Roy and innumerable other patriotic leaders and workers. If you are not still destroyed he follows the curious alternative of bluff as against the British Government and a grovelling attitude as towards the Muslims. He claims to be a great admirer of the British people. They welcome this compliment but are not deceived. For the Muslims, he claims unbounded love and friendship. He would rather die in the hands of Dr. Ansari than survive in the hands of Dr. Moonje. There is nothing he would not do for the Muslims and the notorious blank-cheque-theory owes its origin to the tactics of this kind. He would remain silent over the most atrocious outrages perpetrated by fanatical Muslims on innocent Hindus; massacres, murders, kidnappings, sacrileges on temples—all these he would silently accept with that hateful smile which is so admired by his faithful chelas. But the Muslims are not deceived either.

10. Many of these Mahatmic traits are fully brought out in the pages of this publication. Readers of this book are likely to feel that the author, sometimes, uses unduly strong language, that his indictment of the Mahatma has too much adjectival flavour in it and that it would have lost nothing of its force and cogency if it had been couched in milder language; but the author will argue that the evasiveness and elusiveness of the Mahatma leave him no option and he will be able to show that older and more moderate people have also felt impelled to write equally strongly of the Mahatma's contradictions and somersaults.

Even a seasoned statesman like the late Sir Sankaran Nair, an ex-president of the Indian National Congress, was driven to refer to the Mahatma as "either a fool or a knave." Personally I think there is no difference between a fool and a knave. A knave is in the long run a fool, and a fool can do as much harm as a knave. But I would earnestly request the reader to subordinate the question of the language used and to read the facts and the evidence which the author marshals from various independent sources in order to support the conclusion of the conspiracy that he seeks to draw. Men like Col. Joshia Wedgwood, the late Rev. C. F. Andrews, Pandit Malaviya, Mr. Shastri, newspapers like the 'Leader' and the 'Madras Express,' to mention only a few, have drawn, as this book shows, more or less the same conclusion, in different words it may be, as the author of this book has done.

11. It is unquestionable that the amazing elasticity of the Mahatma's mind and conscience makes him say and do the most contradictory things. With the profound air of saintliness he will support two contradictory conclusions if that suits his purpose for the time being; in the eye of his admirers he increases his saintliness thereby. With non-violence on his lips and in his pen, he was acting as a recruiting sergeant for the British in the war of 1914-18. At Amritsar, he was urging the Congress to utilise the new reforms. In 1920, he was preparing for an election campaign under the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms and was laying down the most meticulous rules as to what kind of candidates should be supported. But as soon as Lala Lajpat Rai in a moment of indignation against the Dyer atrocities at Jalianwala Bag, suggested the boycott of the councils, the Mahatma jumped at the idea and made it his own as he saw that the launching of such non-co-operation would help him with his Muslim friends as the Hindu defender of the Khilafat. At the second Round Table Conference he declared most unequivocally that he would rather die than allow untouchability to be placed on the statute book. And in 1932 he purchased his life with the help of the Gandhi-Ambedkar pact which firmly establishes untouchability on the statute book and so it stands there. At the time of



the earth-quake in Bihar in 1934, he boldly declared with incredible cynicism that the Behar tragedy which resulted in innumerable number of children including even non-Hindu children being buried alive was due to the anger of God against the presence of untouchability amongst the Hindus. He would advise the world to surrender to any aggressor rather than resist him by counter force. And yet he would declare when it suits him that he would look with indifference on anarchy. He "neither supports nor opposes" the communal electorates—whatever that may mean. He has given seven mutually destructive definitions of Swaraj and when I pointed this out at the Karachi Congress in 1931, he threatened to increase that number to twenty. He wants freedom and independence for India. But he would stand aside when the Amir of Afghanistan invades India and would even welcome the Nizam as the Emperor of India. He would stand for a united Indian Nation, but at the same time he would not mind Pakistan if the Muslims wanted it. He does not want the domination of one race or community by another but he considers the Nizam's rule as "Cent per cent Swaraj." He hates tyranny but would welcome a tyrant provided the tyrant is a swadeshi one. The objection is apparently not to tyranny but to its foreign origin. An indigenous tyrant will mean "cent per cent swaraj" to the Mahatma. This amounts almost to saying that if an Indian tiger devours the Mahatma he would prefer it to an attack by a foreign tiger. A snake may safely bite him, so runs the Mahatmic argument, if it is only an *Indian* snake. It would require a whole volume to point out many more such absurdities. But the more numerous the absurdities the greater is the admiration of his followers.

12. In order to secure the support of the Muslims he will pamper them to any extent. But the Muslims also like the British are not deceived. The Mahatma started with the support to Khilafat in 1920, and has continued this pampering for the next twenty years with ever increasing vigour. But the result was no better. In 1921, he got his reward in the Mopla atrocities in Malabar and in 1940 in the Sukkur massacre in Sind with many intervals of similar atrocities in almost every part of India. But his

infatuation has not ended. We had paraded before us the idea of Hindu-Muslim unity as a part of the Mahatma's constructive programme and also as the precursor of Swaraj. But we have instead of achieving the unity, very nearly achieved Pakistan and the champion of the Hindu-Muslim unity is now an avowed supporter of Pakistan if the Muslims but *want* it. He will make a mountain out of a mole-hill at Rajkot but in Hyderabad with a hundred times more population he will allow tyranny to go on unchallenged. For Mr. Jinnah, the Mahatma shows a respect which is alike hypocritical and degrading but Vinayak Savarkar does not even so much as exist for the self than Mahatma.

13. This is the correct picture of the Mahatma's mental make-up. With such background there is nothing to wonder if the Mahatma allowed himself to be associated remotely it may be, indirectly it may be, with the move to support a foreign invasion of his own country. Is he not prepared to welcome Pakistan if the Muslims *want* it as already stated? Has he not supported the communal electorates? Has he not, academically it may be, declared that the Nizam as the future Emperor of India has no terrors for him? Is he not the author of the notorious blank-cheque-theory? Has he not with supreme indifference watched in Bengal, the Frontier Province and elsewhere the slaughter of the Hindus, the abductions of Hindu women and the similar other outrages? Is he not in short prepared to go to any length if only the Mussalmans accept him as their leader? Is there any surprise therefore if when religious zeal had reached a fever-point and when the Mussalmans were in need of all the support that the Hindus could give them in their misfortune, that the Mahatma should even support an invasion of India if only thereby he becomes the undisputed leader of Hindus and Muslims alike? There is therefore nothing inherently impossible in the Mahatma's support to a contemplated invasion of India. That is the argument of the author of this book.

14. The main theme of this book can be conveniently divided into two parts. First, whether the Mahatma did encourage the idea of an invasion of India by the Amir of

Afghanistan and whether he was also a party to an actual invitation to the Amir to do so. The difference between the two is not great, but I prefer to deal with them separately. There is irrefutable evidence that he did actually encourage an invasion of India by the Amir and even declared that he did not care if the Amir came. He went further and said that he would ask the Indian people not to assist the Government of India in resisting such an invasion. Whether the draft of the telegram said to have been sent to the Amir requesting him not to make peace with the Government of India but to carry on the Third Afghan War was in the Mahatma's hand or not may be impossible to ascertain now. But so high an authority as the late Swami Shraddhanand says, "What was my astonishment when I saw the draft of the selfsame telegram in the peculiar handwriting of the father of the Non-violent Non-co-operation Movement." Those who want to know the truth will hesitate before saying that such a piece of evidence should be ignored.

15. The Afghan intrigue first came to light through a public speech by Maulana Mohamed Ali in Madras in 1921 declaring unequivocally that if the Amir of the Afghans invaded India, he would assist the Amir; when it was feared that the Maulana would be arrested for making such a treasonable and unpatriotic statement the Mahatma declared that the Ali Brothers had done nothing what he himself would not do. He admitted that his article in 'Young India' did amount to an invitation to the Amir to start an invasion. Mr. Andrews, who was such an intimate friend of the Mahatma, told him that the said article bore the interpretation of an invitation to invade. The Mahatma admitted that accusation as true. The Mahatma himself therefore pleads guilty to the first charge.

16. From these and several other facts stated in this book, I am satisfied that the Mahatma's writings and speeches in those days did lend themselves to the very well-founded accusation that he had supported the Ali Brothers in their intrigue to the extent of not opposing the invasion. The Mahatma does come out in this matter as an abettor if not the actual perpetrator. The evidence on the second point is not copious

and is also indirect. Except the statement of Sir William Vincent, the then Home-Member there is nothing *direct* to prove an invitation to invade. In order however that no doubt whatever should be left on this second issue it has been suggested that the Hindu Mahasabha to appoint a committee of inquiry on which it should invite two Hindus, two Muslims, one Parsi, one Sikh and one Christian. They should sift the evidence after inviting the Mahatma to make his own statement if any and then on the strength of the evidence and the circumstances attending the events of those days, the Committee should make up its mind whether the Mahatma had or had not any hand in the move to invite the Amir of Afghanistan to invade India. I think however, that no useful purpose will be served by such an inquiry twenty years after the event when the principal actors in the drama are not alive and when the Mahatma himself has denied the charge in his own Mahatmic manner.

17. I have dealt with the main points raised in this book. It now remains to add that the evil atmosphere which has been generated by the Mahatma's endeavours to become a Prophet, has totally demoralised the public life of India. The Mussalmans whom he chooses to pamper in every possible way have taken him at his word and their fanatical section have not only grasped everything that he could give but are asking for more. They now want India to be cut into two pieces under the new fangled scheme of Pakistan. The stand taken is not merely the protection of a minority in a self-governing India but a two-nations theory—nations so entirely distinguished from each other in culture and outlook that not only they are distinct entities today but must remain so till the end of time. In effect this scheme is a crude attempt to foment a civil war in India and to keep it perpetually going. The minorities in each federated section are to remain hostages for the good conduct of the majorities in the other federated areas. It is conveniently forgotten that if the Muslim minority can demand a Pakistan in India, the Sikh and Hindu minorities in the so-called Pakistan will by a parity of reasoning be entitled to demand a similar dis-

memberment of Pakistan itself. Why the Hindu and the Sikh majorities in certain districts of Pakistan should not claim separation we are not told. The fact is, that the scheme is a result of a shallow mind whose ambition has got the better of his reason. Mr. Jinnah's conceit prevents him from standing shoulder to shoulder with his equals and he loves to rule in Pakistan rather than serve in Hindusthan. The British Government in the throes of a most serious war is anxious to keep the Indian Muslims in good humour and the Muslim Powers outside India in an attitude of friendly neutrality. They have therefore remained conveniently silent over the Pakistan issue and have not hesitated to give it even a covert support. But if India is not to be divided into warring provinces as China was at one time, if the unselfish endeavours of patriotic Indians for the last fifty years are not to be stultified, if democracy is not to be smothered in the name of minority protection, if a minority is not to be permitted to veto and hold up the progress of 400 million people, if fanaticism is not to receive a premium and if the British Government possess even one shred of honesty in dealing with this country, then this monstrous doctrine of Pakistan should be laid low by its prompt and indignant repudiation.

18. The author of this book is seriously oppressed with the feeling that no matter what attempts the Hindus might make to live as citizens of a common country along with their Muslim fellow countrymen the Pakistanwallas are too fanatical to appreciate the broader standpoint. It will be futile to say that there is not much in our country at the present which does not support this conclusion nor will it be wise to ignore the menace to India's territorial integrity. And yet I have always cherished the belief that the founders of the Indian National Congress were far-sighted statesmen, that they really believed in an Indian Nation of the future and that despite religious and racial differences India was destined one day to become a united nation, strong, tolerant, patriotic, religious without being fanatical. The whole history of the United States of America has lent hope to such a conviction. The thirteen crores of Americans are not of one race nor of one religion. The present European war

shows how bitter racial feuds are among the European countries, how Christian nations do not hesitate to slaughter one another, how the Poles, the Germans, the Russians, the Bulgarians, the Italians, the French, the Spanish and the innumerable Balkan and Baltic States are ready at a hint to fly at the throat of one another and butcher them without mercy, how the Roman Catholic hanged and quartered the Protestant in the middle ages, how the Latin and Non-Latin races in Europe have considered each other as their age-long enemies, how the Scotch killed the English and how the English murdered the Scottish people and yet in the continent of America particularly the United States these self-same races have managed for centuries to live together in peace and have consolidated themselves into one nation, richer and more powerful than any other. If this is what could be accomplished in America, there is no reason why the faith of the founders of Indian National Congress should not achieve a similar consummation in this country. Provided we abjure fanaticism, the Hindus and Muslims can still become a united nation, and I am certain that that is also the faith of the Sikh, the Christians, the Parsi, the Jew and the smaller minorities. It would be wrong to ignore their views and to consider that they are so much chattel, rather than they are fellow citizens whose voice should receive the most tender consideration. Not one of these latter wants a Pakistan and no other sensible Indian wants it. There are enough cultured and patriotic Muslims like Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan who think in the same direction but their voice is drowned in the dirge of the fanatic. If the ostentatious generosity of the Mahatma were replaced by a truly nationalist outlook in the Congress, if the British Government could be made to realise that the game of divide and rule was up, if the minorities could be reassured by all legitimate or rational concessions to secure them against any conceivable wrong without giving a go-bye to the essentials of democracy, India may yet be saved from Gandhism and the sacred idea of a united nation in India conceived by the founders of the Indian National Congress and fostered by patriots like Lokmanya Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai, Pandit Motilal Nehru,

**Deshbandhu Das, Vithalbhai Patel, Kelkar and others may yet become practical politics.**

**Ridge Road, Malbar Hill,  
Bombay, 14th February, 1941** }

**Jamnadas M. Mehta**

## PREFACE

---

THE IDEA of compiling this book and publishing it before the Madura Session of the Hindu Mahasabha was suggested to the author in October last, while he was engaged in writing a series of articles on this problem in 'Kesari.' The task of preparing the press copy was finished in the first week of December and it was rushed through the press within two weeks; but Barr. Jamnadas M. Mehta, who had kindly promised to introduce this book to the public could not spare sufficient time for this work in that busy month; and therefore we had to postpone the date of publication. Many of our friends thought that we would not be fortunate enough to get his introduction. But in spite of their fears we decided to wait. And it was a wise decision, for the forceful Foreword of Barr. Jamnadas M. Mehta, would now be one of the most important features of this book. The support of such a prominent personality emboldens us to face our opponents without any anxiety. By writing this outspoken Foreword he has rendered a great service to our nation. We, as well as the public owe him a deep debt of gratitude. Dr. Raghuvver of Lahore has kindly given us permission to reprint his article on 'True Nationalism' from the 'Mahratta.' The chapter on the Partition of India was translated from the original Marathi by the editor of the 'Mahratta' and was published in that journal. Barr. Savarkar's article on Hyderabad was originally published in the 'Mahratta.' For the permission of reprinting these and various other items we must thank Mr. G. V. Ketkar., the editor of the paper. Mr. Deo, the assistant librarian of the Servants of India Society lent us the rare old files of 'The Leader', 'The Citizen', 'The People', etc. Without his help the author could not have prepared this formidable charge-sheet. Mr. Barve the assistant librarian of the K. M. Library was equally helpful. The sixty pages comprising the chapters from 'Wartime Treachery' to 'Muslim Raj in India' have been freely translated from our articles in Kesari by Prof. V. V. Dixit. The open letter. Gandhiji's surrender to the



Muslims, and the conclusion were written in collaboration with a young scholar who has obtained the fellowship of his College. He prefers to remain anonymous.

Now one word about the book itself. We know that the book will shock the ordinary readers. But they should remember that a schism in a decaying Empire regularly splits the society within its sphere of influence into the same three fractions—the ruling class, the Have-nots within the border and the Have-nots on and adjoining the border. The Have-nots within the border further split themselves into two sections, the one trying to overthrow the ruling class by violence and the other by non-violence. The violent section conspires with the frontier and trans-frontier Have-nots to overthrow the ruling class and the non-violent section paves the way for the foreign enemy by preaching the immorality of self-defence. This is an invariable law of history. In India the frontier and trans-frontier Have-nots are represented by the wild border tribes and Afghanistan. The Have-nots within the border are represented by the combination of the Pacifists, the Pan-Islamists and the Marxists. The Pan-Islamists and the Marxists have been intriguing with the foreign enemy for the last twenty years at least; and the Pacifists under the leadership of Gandhiji have been preaching the benefits to be derived from a policy of surrender. This open conspiracy in our country thrives because of the mistaken conception that economic self-interest is the fundamental motive in human society. If the country believes in that theory sooner or later it will be delivered to the tender mercies of the wild border tribes, and their kinsmen in Afghanistan. The principle of cultural nationalism alone can prevent this disaster. Those who pretend to strive for self-government must show some respect to the principle of Government itself. Preaching anarchy is not the way to self-government.

*The Author.*

## CONSPIRACY ?





## CONTENTS

---

CHAPTER	PAGE
An open Letter to Gandhiji ... ..	1
True Nationalism ... ..	22
Intrigues with Hyderabad ... ..	27
Surrender to Muslims ... ..	45
Shraddhanand v/s Gandhiji ... ..	54
Pre-war Conspiracies of the Indian Muslims...	64
Wartime Treachery ... ..	69
Tilak v/s Gandhi ... ..	78
Origin of Khilafat Movement ... ..	85
Afghan Emissaries \ ... ..	94
Muslim Raj in India ... ..	118
The Afghan Menace ... ..	129
Afghans and Partition of India ... ..	136
Nationalist Muslims ... ..	165
Conclusion ... ..	170
Appendix : Evidences ... ..	177

[ Continued overleaf ]

1. Mr. Shastri Interviewed ...	177
2. India and Afghanistan ...	178
3. The Afghan Question ...	182
4. Mr. Mohamed Ali and Jihad ...	188
5. Mr. Mohamed Ali's Explanation ...	191
6. 'Madras Mail' on Mohamed Ali ...	198
7. The Alleged Afghan Spy ...	201
8. Mr. Abul Kalam Azad's Views ...	203
9. Lala Lajpat Rai on 'Afghan Bogey' ...	205
10. The Story of the Afghan Spy ...	206
11. 'Leader' on Amir's Denial ...	207
12. A. I. C. C. : Congress Foreign Policy...	208
13. The Menace of Muslim Raj ...	210
14. Soviet Intrigues on Indian Frontier ...	212
15. Gandhi's Hatred for Tilak ...	214
16. Change in Muslim View-point ...	215
17. Let Hindus Learn ! ...	216
18. This Wretched Award ...	217
19. Gandhi's Truth ...	218
20. India's Case for Swaraj ...	219

## AN OPEN LETTER TO GANDHIJI

*Dear Gandhiji,*

In a cricket season a well-known professor of the New Poona College confided to his students that although he could not play cricket, he could talk on cricket for hours. That forgotten incident occurred to me as I took up my pen to address you this open letter. You have been talking on truth for years; but unfortunately you have rarely spoken it. And yet you resent any attack on your precious reputation, although you have never had the courage to face a fair and honest scrutiny of your hypocritical life. In your reply to my charges you have said that life for you would be a burden if you were to make it a point of controverting every false report about you or a distortion of your writing. I do not desire to add to your burdens. I am asking you simply to unburden your conscience if indeed you possess any conscience at all at present. For it is suspected that you have already sold it when you entered into an unholy alliance with the Ali Brothers, to stir up an Afghan invasion against the Government of India.

In the 'Harijan' of 10-2-40, you have categorically declared that so far as the charge of your intriguing with the Amir is concerned there is no truth whatever in it. In this connection I deem it necessary to bring to your notice your own injunction to the non-co-operators. "It is not enough for a non-co-operator not to mean violence; it is necessary that his speech must not be capable of a contrary interpretation by reasonable men!" (15-6-1921 'Young India')

I am going to apply the same maxim to your intrigues with the Amir. I hope, you will concede that the Right Honourable Mr. Shrinivas Shastri is a reasonable man. May I remind you that Mr. Shastri was the first person to suggest that the leaders of the non-co-operation movement who were loudly declaring from public platforms that the Moderates were guilty of high treason to the people, were themselves guilty of high treason. I will cite his exact words from the 'Leader' of 11-4-1921.

"I am aware of the old, old anti-thesis between treason to the people and treason to the king, with which strong propagandists can make effective play, but I am not frightened. I will content myself with pleading not guilty of either form of treason and expressing the hope that my critics could do the same without violating their conscience."

Mr. Shastri was too generous in supposing that traitors who were active in stirring up a foreign enemy could have any conscience; but as to the treasonable tendencies of the non-co-operators, he was perfectly right. In his interview Mr. Shastri had also stated:

"Fears are entertained. we can only hope they are unfounded that the frontier and transfrontier troubles are in part at least encouraged and stimulated by the unprecedented unrest caused by the non-co-operation movement. It sounds a strong thing to say and I have no facts on which to proceed, but there is nothing inherently improbable in a powerful movement designed to overthrow Government though only by peaceful means, being regarded by aliens as a propitious occasion, for their aggressive schemes."

Here Mr. Shastri has explained only the indirect connection between the non-co-operation movement and the transfrontier troubles. But Sir William Vincent, the then Home Member, has revealed some facts showing the direct connection between the leaders of the non-co-operation movement and the transfrontier enemies. In a meeting of the Legislative Assembly, on 23-3-1921 he has stated:

“Can any Hon’ble Member say, however, that the co-adjutors and lieutenants of Mr. Gandhi act on the same peaceful principles, whether they are actuated by the same motives ? Has that ever been seriously believed by any non-official who has been in contact with some of Mr. Gandhi’s lieutenants recently ? Let us take the case of two prominent Muslims who identify themselves with the case of Mr. Gandhi. Has it not been freely bruited abroad rightly or wrongly that they conceive the idea of a Mussalman Empire in this country ? Has it not even been said that they intend to effect this with the aid of foreign enemies ? Has it not even been said that they contemplate an invasion of this country by a foreign power within a couple of months, which invasion Muslims inside this country are to aid ? If there is nothing in all these rumours why was then this anxiety recently to prevent friendly negotiations being arranged between the Amir of Afghanistan and the British Government ? Was it not rather a curious attitude to take up ?”

You had attacked this speech of Sir William in an article called “Divide and Rule” and yet you had evaded a direct reply to the explicit charges that he had made. We agree, that it was his policy to divide and rule and hence he did not reveal your share in these conspiracies with foreign enemies. That you were involved in these conspiracies is proved from your interview to the ‘Daily Express,’ in which you referred “to preparations that were then made in Afghanistan as being really in support of the Khilafat.” That you were aware of the preparations for the invasion of India by the Afghans on the pretext of the Khilafat, is obvious from the above interview given in April 1921. This is one of those evidences, I suppose, which proves that there is no truth whatever in the charge of your intriguing with the Amir ! In 1922 Sir Shankaran Nair had exclaimed “But for the fact that he (Mr. Gandhi) is well-known to be a saint and Mahatma, I would have had no hesitation in saying that his observations about meeting the Afghans show him to be either a fool or a knave.” After the experience of so many years I have come to the conclusion that not only you are not a fool but a most dangerous knave



and an expert in the science of fooling other people. It is a bitter thing to say but I cannot avoid it. When the situation on the frontier was extremely critical and when according to a statement of Mr. Montagu, the total casualties of British forces on the North West Frontier of India from the 1st January 1919 to the 30th of April 1921 amounted to 8,472 including 5,169 killed, 2,474 wounded and 829 missing, you were writing in 'Young India,'

"I warn the reader against believing in the bogey of an Afghan invasion. A weak, disarmed, helpless, credulous India does not know how this Government has kept her under hypnotic spell. Even some of the best of us today really believe that the military budget is being piled up for protecting India against foreign invasion." (4-5-1921)

Your last sentence was a left-handed fling at Mr. Shastri for having said that the non-co-operation movement had its own share in the piling up of figures in the military budget. This is an instance of your truthfulness, I suppose.

To lie and to give false and psuedo-heroic promises to the public has by now become a second nature to you. In your recent article on Hyderabad in the 'Harijan' of 13-10-40 you have promised to die in the anarchic flame whilst vainly attempting to still it with your tiny, shaky hands. Before starting the Khilafat movement you had given us a similar promise.

"I will co-operate wholeheartedly with the Muslim friends in the prosecution of their just demands so long as they act with sufficient restraint and so long as I feel sure that they do not wish to resort to or countenance violence. I should cease to co-operate and advise every Hindu and for that matter everyone else to cease to co-operate, the moment there was violence actually done, advised or countenanced. The cause is doomed if anger, hatred, ill-will, wrecklessness and finally violence is to reign supreme. I shall resist them with my life even if I should stand alone." (‘Young India’ 10-3-1920)

The way in which you belied the above promise can well be ascertained from your article in 'Young India,' 13-4-21.

"It is no use isolating me from the rest. As Maulana Mahomed Ali often puts it, war is bad but there are worse things than war. The Brothers are honestly and industriously endeavouring to secure a peaceful settlement. But should their effort prove vain either for want of response from the Government or the people as lovers of their faith they will not hesitate to precipitate war if they could. As for my own attitude, whilst my faith would not permit me to invite or encourage a war of violence, I do contemplate with equanimity a state of war in preference to the present state of effeminate peace imposed by force of arms. And it is for that reason that I am taking part in this movement of non-violent non-co-operation even at the risk of anarchy being the ultimate result."

The contradiction between the two passages is too obvious. Your promise to advise the Hindus and others also to non-co-operate with the Muslims and even to lay down your life in case the Muslims resorted to, advised or countenanced violence has proved false. The Malbar Tragedy at least should have reminded you of your promise. Is there any reason to suppose that you are more sincere in giving the same promise this time?

Before beginning the Khilafat movement you were not ready to tell the Hindus openly that the success of the movement was dependent on the response from the Afghan Government. But in less than a year you were openly canvassing public opinion in favour of the Afghan invasion. It is no wonder then, that reasonable Muslims wished to secure from you a written invitation to the Afghans to invade India. In order to prove my allegations I will cite some evidence. In 'Young India' of 4-5-1921 you have published the following letter by Mr. Afhad Husein :

"You know that Maulana Mahomed Ali has publicly declared from a platform in the Madras Presidency that he would assist the Amir of Afghanistan if he came towards

India against those who have emasculated Islam and who are in wrongful possession of the Holy Places etc. I think Indian opinion is divided on this question. The Moderates are bent upon crushing any such movement. Even the nationalists such as Lala Lajpat Rai and Messrs. Das and Malaviya have not spoken out their mind, nay even you have not taken any notice of this very important speech. It may be high treason to show sympathy and give open assistance to the king's enemy, but in these days of frank talk and candid speech one is eager to hear the decision of leaders. It is a vital question."

This letter proves conclusively that according to an average Muslim, Maulana Mahomed Ali was preaching high treason from public platforms and that they expected you to do the same in the press. I suppose, even you would concede that this infamous letter amounted to an overt invitation to you to commit the crime of high treason. The very fact that such a letter was addressed to you denotes that reasonable people rightly suspected you of treasonable activities.

And immediately afterwards you provided them with irrefutable evidence on this point. At the Allahabad District Conference, held on 10-5-1921 you declared openly,

"I cannot understand why the Ali Brothers are going to be arrested as the rumour goes, and why I am to remain free. They have done nothing which I would not do. If they had sent a message to the Amir, I also would send one to inform the Amir, that if he came no Indian, so long as I can help it, would help the Government to drive him back. If a man is true to his religion no Afghan or any power on earth can make him transgress his religious precepts."

This speech of yours as reported by the 'Leader' clearly proves that on the 10th of May 1921 you were aware of the impending arrest of the Ali Brothers and of the veritable reason for that decision of the Government, namely, their treasonable message to the Amir, and also that you were at that time prepared to send a similar message to the same enemy of India, in order to prove your solidarity with the conspiring

Ali Brothers. It also proves that the message sent to the Amir by Maulana Mahomed Ali with your approval was really an invitation to the Amir to invade India, and that you were canvassing in favour of the Afghans by assuring the Hindus that Afghan domination need not necessarily mean the destruction of Hinduism. In the search-light of these damning revelations, Swami Shraddhanand's modest accusations pale into insignificance. In order to enable you to compare your own confessions with the late Swamiji's accusations I am transcribing that familiar passage once more.

“Maulana Mahomed Ali complained about political leaders taking him to task for sending a wire to the Sultan of Kabul, urging him not to make peace with the British Government. I too urged that it was not a wise step that he had taken. Brother Mahomed Ali took me aside and taking out a paper from his handbag gave a draft of a telegram to me to read. What was my astonishment when I saw the draft of the selfsame telegram in the peculiar handwriting of the father of the non-violent non-co-operation movement !”

When this passage was brought to your notice you gave the following false explanation in the ‘Harijan’ of 10-2-1940,

“I do not remember having drafted any telegram on behalf of Maulana Mahomed Ali to the then Amir. The alleged telegram is harmless in itself and does not warrant the deduction drawn from it. The late Swamiji never referred the matter to me for confirmation.”

The late Swamiji's information about the dangerous character and the authorship of the alleged telegram was strikingly confirmed by your speech at the Allahabad District Conference at which he himself was present and, therefore, he might not have felt it necessary to refer the matter to you for confirmation. I think, if any reasonable man studies the documents in question, he must concede that I have proved my charge to the hilt as Barr. Savarkar has generously put it. If in spite of this you wish to persist in denying the charge of intriguing with the Amir, I can only say that you are at

liberty to deny the truth and be damned. As regards your assurance that the Hindus need not necessarily lose their religion on account of Afghan domination, I must say that I regard it as a piece of disgusting hypocrisy. You should have given that assurance to the Muslims who were striving to recover their Holy Places from the Christian Powers. No sane Hindu can attach any value to such an absurd statement, so long as the tragic history of Muslim Rule in India has not been sufficiently distorted by your henchmen like Dr. Rajendra Prasad.

The name of Dr. Rajendra Prasad reminds me of a forgotten confession of yours which has been intentionally suppressed by that honourable man. You too have conveniently ignored it in the present controversy. I refer to the admissions that you made, while answering ostensibly Mr. Andrews, but in truth Lord Reading, the then Viceroy, in 'Young India.' You have conveniently forgotten it as Dr. Rajendra Prasad has taken good care to omit your admission from the published volumes of 'Young India.' On page 718 of 'Young India,' Babu Rajendra summarises your answer to Andrews as follows :

" On Mr. Andrews asking Mr. Gandhi whether the above article was not an invitation to the Afghans to invade India and whether thereby he did not become a party to violence Mr. Gandhi wrote in 'Young India' of 18th May 1921 denying that he invited Afghans, expressing his anxiety that they should not go to India's assistance and affirming that India was quite capable of settling with the Government without extraneous aid."

I ask you if this is a fair summary of your answer as appearing in the original files of 'Young India.'

" Is not my article on the Afghan Bogey an invitation to the Afghans to invade the Indian border and thus do I not become a direct party to violence ?" Thus asks Mr. Andrews. " My article was written for Indians and for the Government. I do not believe the Afghans to be so foolish

as to invade India on the strength of my article. *But I see that it is capable of bearing the interpretation put upon it by Mr. Andrews. I therefore hasten to inform all whom it may concern, that not only do I not want to invite the Afghans or anybody else to come to our assistance but I am anxious for them not to come to our assistance.* I am quite confident of India's ability to settle with the Government without extraneous help. Moreover I am interested in demonstrating the perfect possibility of attaining our end only by non-violent means."

This reply to Mr. Andrews is one of the most remarkable and damaging confessions, extracted from you by the force of circumstances, the other being your confession as regards the Rajkot fiasco. This damaging evidence, which was purposely concealed from the public by your lieutenants, lest it should deprive you of the halo of saintliness, proved firstly, that your article on Afghan Bogey was an invitation to the Afghans to invade the Indian border and thus you had become a direct party to violence. When I made the same charge you were bold to deny it. This proves your deceitfulness, hypocrisy and unscrupulousness which are all according to your opinion the attributes of Satan. Secondly, under the pretence of satisfying a friend you apologised to the Government in an under-hand manner. Tendering an apology is generally regarded as an act of cowardice. But tendering an apology in secret leaving your friends in lurch is an act of gross betrayal. In the heated atmosphere of Allahabad you were loudly proclaiming your solidarity with the Ali Brothers in their conspiracies with the Amir. And immediately afterwards from the cool heights of Simla you were informing all those whom it might concern that not only you did not want to invite the Afghans but you were anxious for them not to come to your assistance. This was certainly a breach of faith with the Ali Brothers. However I must admit that you were sure of carrying the Ali Brothers with you in your climb down. For secret messages

from Kabul were reaching Maulana Mahomed Ali, informing him that his aggressive pan-Islamist policy was not likely to find much favour with those who were looking after the national interests of Afghanistan. In his Congress Presidential Address at Cocanada Maulana Mahomed Ali has revealed, "I have heard that my Madras speech of 1921 had not found much favour even in Afghanistan." The Viceroy also was equally well informed and determined to humiliate the conspirators once for all. The way in which he terrified the Ali Brothers and you also and got that apology is revealed by Pandit Motilal Neharu's letter to you, anonymously published in 'Young India' of 15-6-1921. He says,

"The case, which more forcibly than any other comes to my mind at the moment, is that of Hamid Ahamad, who has recently been sentenced at Allahabad to transportation for life and forfeiture of property. Is there any reason why this man should not be saved? I find, Maulana Mahomed Ali pays him a high tribute in his Bombay Speech of the 30th of May 1921. What consolation this tribute will bring to Hamid Ahamad from a man *similarly situated* who has saved himself by an apology and an undertaking, I cannot say."

I suspect, that the case of Hamid Ahamad who had received the thundering sentence of transportation for life and forfeiture of property had made an equally strong impression on you and your associates and therefore you tendered an undignified apology to Lord Reading. I know, that you court imprisonment often enough, but you prefer to come out of the gaol as soon as you can. It is hardly necessary to explain that I am referring to your notorious fasts of 1933.

When you had suffered a serious diminution of your prestige by your underhand dealings with the Government, you induced the Government to issue an agreed statement of facts relating to the Ali Brothers' apology. While commenting on that statement you had tried to impress on your credulous readers,

"It makes it clear that the apology, as I have called the statement of regrets, initiated with me, and that it was conceived before I ever knew of the impending prosecution for the speeches that were shown to me and that it was neither suggested nor made for fear of the prosecution of the Brothers, certainly not to avoid imprisonment."

The impression conveyed by this sentence is utterly false. The prosecution of the Ali Brothers was decided upon by the Government on the 6th of May. You referred to their impending prosecution in your speech at the Allahabad District Conference on the 10th of May and immediately afterwards you went to Simla to meet Lord Reading. In spite of these proven facts, you have the temerity to suggest that the apology initiated with you before you ever knew of their impending prosecution. Saints and Mahatmas have a most inconvenient past, it seems. The poet Bhavabhuti has already advised वृद्धास्ते न त्रिचारणीयचरिताः (one should not look too closely into the lives of old men.)

That the apology you tendered, was imposed upon you by the Government against your will is evident from your subsequent actions. In spite of that ignominious apology, you continued your intrigues with the Afghan Government. The evidence supporting the above assertion is contained in the resolutions of the All India Congress Committee and the Working Committee in 1921. In Nagpur Session of the Muslim League, you had moved a resolution advising the Amir not to sign a treaty with the British Government, but you could not move a similar resolution in Nagpur Congress for fear of opposition by Malaviya and others. In the beginning of April, Mahomed Ali began to canvass public opinion in favour of Afghan invasion and pressed the Congress to pass a resolution on lines similar to those of the Muslim League Resolution. On the 26th of April a meeting of the Bombay Muslims was held under the auspices of the



Central Khilafat Committee, and it passed the following resolution.

“In view of the fact that the destiny of the people of India is inevitably linked with that of the neighbouring Asiatic Nations and powers, this public meeting of the Mussalmans of Bombay request the All India Congress Committee to promote feelings of amity and concord with neighbouring states, and with a view to establish mutual goodwill and sympathy, to formulate a clear and definite foreign policy for India.”

Thereupon the All India Congress Committee resolved to carry out the orders of their masters and asked the Working Committee to frame a statement on Indian foreign policy. The Working Committee on its part entrusted the matter to you. Your draft was so injurious to the national interests that even the subservient Working Committee advised you to recast the original draft. That you may not deny this fact, I quote the resolution of the Working Committee, passed in the first week of September at Calcutta.

“That the note on foreign policy prepared and placed before the meeting by Mahatma Gandhi be recast in the light of the discussion by the members and be circulated among the members of the Working Committee and submitted for the approval at the next meeting of the Working Committee.”

We will be obliged if you will be good enough to make public your original draft which was rejected by the Working Committee. Even the amended resolution which was passed at Bombay on the 5th of October, makes a very painful reading, as the following sentences will show:—

“India as a self-governing country can have nothing to fear from the neighbouring States or any State as her people have no designs upon any of them and hence no intention of establishing any trade relations hostile to or not desired by such States.

“The Committee wishes also to assure the Mussalman States that when India attains self-government her foreign policy will naturally be always guided so as to respect the religious obligations imposed upon Mussalmans by Islam.”

The first sentence enunciates a most stupid and ridiculous proposition. As a goat has no designs on a tiger, she can have nothing to fear from that non-violent animal! The special reference to the trade relations shows the hidden hand of the Afghan foreign minister Tarzi, behind it. The Government of India had disallowed the transit of arms through India to Afghanistan and the Afghan Government was very anxious to have this embargo removed and hence the inclusion of the above in your statement on foreign policy. Your 'holy' support enabled them to have the restrictions removed. Secondly, you assured the Muslim States that after having attained self-government, Indian Foreign policy will naturally be always guided so as to respect the religious obligations imposed upon Mussalmans by Islam. What these religious obligations amount to, can be seen from the following quotation—

“According to the Quoranic Law there cannot be peace between a Mahomedan King and his neighbouring infidel states. The latter are Dar-ul-Harb or legitimate seats of war, and it is the Muslim king's duty to slay and plunder in them, till they accept the true faith and become Dar-ul-Islam, after which they will become entitled to his protection.”

(Sarkar's 'Shivaji' pp. 479-489)

This clearly means that India is either to be ruled by Muslims or is to become a legitimate seat of war for the Afghans. This shows that there can be no peace between infidel India and Afghanistan, your previous assurances notwithstanding. Another implication of Islamic religious obligations is that Indian Muslim soldiers are not to fight against the invading Muslim armies. This fact is well illustrated by the recent demand by Mr. Jinnah that Indian Muslim soldiers should not be used against Muslim nations. Hence your assurance to observe Islamic obligations means nothing but consent to the establishment of Muslim Raj in India.

Your partisans complain that I read too much between your lines. To set their doubts at rest I quote an evidence from no less an authority than Hakim Ajmal Khan, the simultaneous President of the Congress and the Khilafat Conference at Ahmedabad. In his presidential address to the Khilafat Conference he blurted out, in your presence,

“India on the one side and the Asia Minor on the other are but two extreme links in a chain of future Islamic Federation, which are gradually but surely joining together all intermediate States in one great system.”

(I. A. R. 1922 p. 447)

This statement is very important as it was made in your presence and unless it is explicitly denied I presume, with your consent. In the same speech the Hakim disclosed the connection between the non-co-operation movement and the non-conclusion of the Afghan Treaty. While discussing the Anglo-Afghan Treaty, he remarked,

“All that could possibly be said against the treaty was that it was perhaps not well-timed and that the Indian people would have approved a further postponement.”

Of course it was not well-timed as the treaty was signed on the very date on which your mass civil disobedience was about to commence at Bardoli, and hence it had to be postponed. That the ratification of the Anglo-Afghan Treaty on February 6th and the final abandonment of mass civil disobedience on February 11th was not a mere coincidence is proved from the above statement of your trusted lieutenant Hakim Ajmal Khan.

The inter-relation between the Khilafat movement and the Amir of Afghanistan was clearly exposed by an independent Englishman, Col. J. C. Wedgwood in his book ‘The Future of the Indo-British Commonwealth’ :—

“That the Amir should become the Khalifa is the wish of every raging Muslim in India. He is on their borders, almost in hand, a permanent threat to British India. Every

conqueror save one has come down from the Afghan passes. India as a whole does not want what the Muslims want. The leaders of Indian thought and politics desire democracy and fear ruler, whether, Ranjeet Singh from the Punjab or an Amir from Kabul. The temporal power of a religion seems to them as wrong as it does to us. As education spreads India may convert the Muslim or the Muslim may convert India. It is quite certain that after what has passed British cannot convert the Indian Muslim from his rage, either by force or fraud or kindness, that conversion must be left to time and India."

No one could have depicted more forcibly the inherent antagonism between genuine (Hindu) nationalism and Muslim fanaticism. Yet you succumbed to the Muslim fanaticism to the detriment of the Hindu Nation.

In fairness to you I must state that you had an idea that the Government would come to terms with the people under the threat of Afghan invasion.

"Mr. Pal suggests that if the Amir invades and if we do not aid the government there can only be a revolution. I venture to suggest another alternative. If India as a non-co-operating India does not assist, the government will make terms with the people. I do not consider the British people to be so utterly devoid of commonsense or resourcefulness as to leave India rather than come to terms with her and heal the Khilafat and the Punjab wounds."

I do not think that this attitude of yours is morally any better, than that of a traitor. This attitude of yours is criticised by the 'Citizen' of Madras as follows:—

"If the Afghans invade he (Gandhi) says the British government rather than run the risk of defeat may come to terms with India which for this purpose must not co-operate with them. This is worse than a direct invitation to the Amir to invade India. That at least has the saving grace of openness, while the other attitude is characterised by wile, artifice and cowardice which we know Mr. Gandhi to abhor. The episode shows the length to which one will be driven if one is weak enough to think that a friend must be supported at all costs whatever may be the indiscretions of which the latter may be guilty. We admire Mr. Gandhi's chivalry but deplore his political degeneracy."

You had already stated that under the threat of Afghan invasion you would compel the British Government to come to terms with you. And hence all your activities were directed to force the Government to listen to you. In fact your programme was to play a double role. Hence Swami Shraddhanand had told you in a straightforward and blunt manner that your pronouncements were always dubious. Before you were sure of the Afghans you were not prepared to lose your British masters, and hence your opposition to the creed of independence.

At one time you were ready to prostitute belief in God in order to oppose the idea of independence.

“But assuming that Great Britain alters her attitude, as I know she will when India is strong, it will be religiously unlawful for us to insist on independence. For it will be vindictive and petulant. It would amount to a denial of God for the refusal will then be based upon the assumption that the British people are not capable of response to the God in man; such a position is untenable for both a believing Mussalman and a believing Hindu.”

In spite of this fanatical opposition to independence you acquiesced in the passing of the resolution of Independence at Madras. If you had opposed that resolution it would not have been passed as was the case in former years. Will you kindly reveal to us the reasons that prompted your acquiescence? Our information is that this change of views was inspired by King Amanullah. Sardar Ikbal Ali Shah, in his ‘Tragedy of Amanullah’ while describing his visit to Bombay in 1927 says,

“And in Bombay, whilst still the guest of British administration, Amanullah made a diplomatic blunder. A big public function was organised in his honour in that city; all the dignitaries were present, including the British Governor, when he urged upon the Indians the necessity of severing their connections with England. That public speech, of course, created a very bad impression for its indelicacy, inasmuch.

as it was tantamount to interfering in the domestic politics of a foreign and friendly country.’’

This information is confirmed by Mr. D. G. Upson, who wrote in the ‘Pioneer,’

“As to India the (Afghan) king proceeded to assure me that he and his people had every sympathy with the national aspirations of Indians. He spoke of a league of Eastern Nations as a greatly cherished project.”

I can make a guess as to the motives of Amanullah in influencing Congress leaders to adopt the Independence Resolution. The well-informed anonymous Muslim author of the, ‘Confederacy of India’ has revealed that the attitude of Amanullah’s Government towards the grant of reforms to India was according to his information hostile. As you had already become a tool in the hands of Amanullah you played his game of thwarting the Indian Reforms, by gradually favouring the party which insisted on the severance of the connection with the British Empire. You might pretend that the idealism of Jawaharlal was responsible for the Independence Resolution and Afghan influence had nothing to do with it. It is well-known that Jawaharlal was expelled from Mussooree for plotting with the Afghan foreign minister. And as to his devotion to independence of which we hear so much now-a-days, you will find that it is merely superficial, by a reference to the issues of ‘Young India’ of January 1922. At the Ahmedabad Congress, Maulana Hasarat Mohani while moving his resolution on changing the Congress creed to independence had said that Jawaharlal Nehru was of the same opinion, and would have supported his resolution, had he not then been in jail. When this news reached Pandit Jawaharlal, he wrote a letter to his paper ‘Independent’ indignantly repudiating the creed of independence and expressing disapproval of the conduct of those who supported the resolution. The text of this letter was published also

in 'Young India.' If in spite of such dubious past Jawaharlal sponsored and you did not oppose the Independence Resolution at Madras Congress, then this change of views must be attributed to the influence exercised over both of you by Amir Amanullah. That Amanullah was and is even now keenly interested in the Indian Independence Movement is obvious from the following interview he gave to Chamanlal.

"When I presented him a copy of my recent book the 'Vanishing Empire' he felt jubilant over the prospect of India attaining complete freedom in the near future, and added that his greatest ambition in life besides serving his country was to see India free. He lost his throne, said he because of his love of India. He did not care for his throne but he still wanted to see Afghanistan in the rank of powerful nations and see India a free Country."

It is clear that the ex-Amir wishes Afghanistan to be powerful and India only to be free. He wishes to see India free from British protection and helpless and dependent on powerful Afghanistan.

Amanullah's friends in India also were anxious to see Afghanistan powerful and therefore were preaching the surrender of certain Indian provinces to Afghanistan. Mr. Mahomed Ali in his speech at the Muslim League Conference in 1924 said,

"If I were to have my own way I would not support the resolution but move an amendment that those parts of the frontier provinces which did not by right belong to India but were really a part of the territories of the people across the Indian border which lay on the other side of the Indus should be given back to those people" (applause)

This speech was made in your presence and with your silent support. The resolution on Hindu-Muslim unity which was passed at the Madras Congress in 1927 meant also the same thing, as is proved by the following statement of Mrs. Sarojini Nayudu, made while moving the resolution.

"They (Muslim leaders) have further said, 'give us if you will by such distribution of provinces on the lines of

: your Congress distribution which will make among other provinces Sind a separate province, that will give to Baluchistan and the North West Frontier Province, with those which Amanullah His Afghan Majesty rules, the opportunity to develop, brotherhood and freedom.”

These words of the Muslim leaders reveal their desire to give these provinces an opportunity to secede from India and join Afghanistan.

The intentions of the Muslim leaders are given expression through Mrs. Nayudu's speeches as also Pandit Jawaharlal's. The following statement of Dr. B. S. Moonje confirms Jawaharlal's subservience to Muslim dictates. The occasion for this statement was Jawaharlal's venomous attack on the Hindu Mahasabha in an address to the students of the Hindu University.

“Young Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in his juvenile exuberance of communism has condemned the Hindu Mahasabha but if the sequence of events that happened immediately preceding his attack is to be borne in mind, it appears that it is a command performance at the dictation of the big brother Maulana Shaukat Ali and is indicative of his defeatist mentality in respect of the Muslims. On the eve of his departure from Bombay to attend the Muslim Leaders Conference at Lucknow Mr. Shaukat Ali had announced to the press in respect of Bhai Paramanand's propaganda against the communal award that he does not propose to enter into a wordy warfare with the Mahasabha, but leaves the task of checkmating its activities to congressmen and the nationalist Hindus. I congratulate Pandit Jawaharlal for having faithfully responded to that dictation. In his fondness for his Persian culture, Pandit Jawaharlal may take pride in forsaking his forefather's religion for his new love of communism but he must understand that there is a limit to the patience of even the proverbially mild and docile Hindu who is still capable of rising in defence of his world-old religion and culture. The wonder however is that Pandit Malaviya did not pull his ears more briskly.”

“Apropos of the Muslim Leaders Conference at Lucknow referred to above, I wish to bring to your notice an important statement of Mr. Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, an ex-Minister in the



Pant Cabinet. In an open letter to Dr. Ansari Mr. Kidwai has stated,

"While you were in Europe there was convened at Lucknow a conference of representatives of the different Muslim organisations. We (All India Muslim Nationalist Party) were represented in this conference by our leaders, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Dr. Syed Mahmud, and Chaudhari Khaliquzzaman. And by the time the Conference came to an end we had agreed to almost everything to oppose which the All India Muslim Nationalist Party had come into existence. For the last few months I have been thinking of resigning the office of the General Secretaryship of the party. You know how reluctant I was to give consent to my election for the post. This reluctance was due not to any lack of enthusiasm in me for the 'Nationalism' but to the fear that, we would not live up to our ideals."

Since that time Khaliquzzaman has become a prominent leader of the Muslim League. Dr. Syed Mahmud has played an important part with Asaf Ali and Ansari in securing the virtual ratification of the communal award by the Congress. As to the great Maulana, he has secured the presidentship of the Congress with your active help and is exploiting the Congress platform to preach that the Muslims are a nation by themselves and agreeably surprising the Muslim Leaguers. I am quoting the following from the 'Times of India,' for your edification.

"Asked about Maulana Azad's remarks regarding the minorities Sir Ali M. K. Dehlavi observed, 'There I must confess I was most agreeably surprised and I am glad to discover that our lost brother the great Maulana is, after all, a Muslim at heart and politically not only that but a pan-Islamist. He has made an authoritative admission, as the duly elected and accredited president of the Congress that the Muslims in India are a nation and not a minority.'"

The logical conclusion of this idea is that the Muslims are the only nation in India and all the others are only communities. The Maulana has already told us at Ramgadh,

"The Muslims in India number between 80 and 90 millions.

The same type of social or racial divisions, which affect other communities do not divide them. The powerful bonds of Islamic brotherhood and equality have protected them to a large extent from the weakness that flows from social divisions."

Eminent Muslim leaders have often declared that

"In default of British control, resigned in weariness or disgust, Indian unity could only be revived and sustained by the Muslims, recruited as they would be by their kinsmen and coreligionists from the regions beyond the North West Frontier."

For this purpose Muslim congressmen are demanding that a large number of tribal people should be recruited to the Indian Army. The Afridi leader Mahomad Jaman Khan told Sir Akbar Hyderi,

"You are the intelligent link between the tribes on the Frontier and the Nizam's State. It is my urgent desire that the roads connecting the frontier to the Hyderabad should be broad and straight."

While all these nefarious intrigues are going on, the lame Maulana is sitting on your shoulders and leading you blindfold to the precipice of anarchy. I am informed that recently you have met an even greater nationalist than the intriguing Maulana to lead you, namely, Nawab Bahadur Yar Jung, the *ame damnè* of His Exalted Highness to whom you are offering to make the Emperor of India. You, the son of a minister in a petty State in Gujarat could not have found a better job than this in the last days of your life. I congratulate you on your choice.

I beg to remain,  
the Emperor-maker's most humble servant,

A. J. Karandikar

# TRUE NATIONALISM

(By: Prof. Raghuvira, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., Lahore)

Language is a force in the making of a nation. The conception of a nation is a very recent development and is not of more than two centuries standing. The words 'nation and nationalism' have come to mean different things in different countries. In India, however, we are at the initial stage. In countries where nationalism is established for a long time, there nationalism has come to mean aggressive action and therefore great men and peaceful men who wish good of the whole world, have come to hate the words 'nation and nationalism.' But in countries which are yet in the state of infancy as regards modern civilisation, nationalism is the only force which can raise those countries to the level of other nations and which can defend them against foreign aggression, economic as well as political.

## NATIONALISM IN INDIA

It is agreed that India must become one nation. It is also agreed that as yet the consciousness of being one nation has not started developing among the men of this country. In India nationalism is not older than three decades. There is no clear conception of nationalism in India as yet. Nationalism in India centres round one idea, the idea of getting rid of British Imperialism. So every Indian who is anti-Imperialistic is a nationalist. One's nationalism is valued in terms of the harshness of the language which one employs in denouncing British Government. This issue has occupied

the entire mind of political India. The other sphere, where the word 'nationalism' has been applied with some force, is the economic sphere. Here too, it is very vague and incomplete. In the cultural sphere, however, it remains unapplied.

### CRITERION OF A NATION

In the West, the only criterion of a nation is its language. In India, however, there are factors which have come into the foreground and have thrown language into the background. In India, the Hindu-Muslim question stands in the way of development of pure nationalism.

It is a very sad thing that Hindus, who belong to this country in every sense of the word, have been completely de-Hinduised in their mental out-look, so much so that absolutely anti-Hindu and anti-national ideals are being accepted and given the name of nationalism.

This means suicide for the Hindus. In the history of the world there is no nation and no religion which has denounced suicide in such strong terms as the Hindus, and still they are committing suicide. The responsibility for this great national crime lies on the leaders and not on the masses.

### CONVERTS OF THE SWORD

Instead of nationalising the Muslims as is happening in Persia and Turkey by definitely de-Arabizing them, here the emphasis is in the wrong direction.

The Muslims of India believe in pan-Islam which to them means the supremacy of Arabia; and the Hindus submit to it in the most shameless fashion. Let it be made known that the political and cultural subjugation of India started a thousand years ago when the Muslim Barbarians came, looted and subjugated northern parts of India which were

dis-united among themselves. The Hindus have shown little political wisdom during all these one thousand years. All sorts of cruelties have been perpetrated by these wild barbarians from the North-West, and among them there was one which would do discredit to any religion of the world.

The poor, the helpless, the lowly, were arraigned before the sword to be beheaded unless they accepted the religion of the executioner.

### LOVE IS JEALOUS

This is the process which has created the situation, which confronts the political India of today. These converts of the sword are bound by ties of faithful regard and piety to countries to the north-west and west of India but not to India itself. This situation, our political leaders in India, are not prepared to face. Such state of affairs must not be allowed to exist and continue if India has to develop as one nation.

Love is jealous, if you love India truly you cannot love another land and if you love another land you cannot love India. We must be undaunted and tell all residents of India that the country which has given birth to them, the country which gives them shelter, demands their whole-hearted faith and love, and does not allow them to look upon other countries in any other way than as foreign countries.

If the Afghans invade India today it is the duty of every Indian to fight them, to crush them and if among us there exist people who would go and make a common cause with the Afghans the world has only one name for them and we must not be afraid of using that word. That word is 'Traitor' and there is only one punishment for a traitor, that is death. So the traitors from India must die out or they must be converted to the love of their motherland.

Those who differ from us, howsoever great they may be, they have not yet imbibed the true spirit of nationalism. Nationalism is a constructive thing, but to construct it must destroy whatever comes in the way of construction.

### THE QUESTION OF LANGUAGE

Imagine an old, intelligent, experienced nation like the Hindus who are being suppressed even in such simple things as language. If for the time being we have not become true nationalists and have not been able to make every resident of India a true nationalist, the reason is that Hindus are not allowing themselves to continue as nationalists. We say with great emphasis that we shall not submit to British Imperialism, but we also ought to say that we shall shake off all the traces of our slavery to the Mughals who are now dead and gone, and who have been a shame to our national history.

In the Punjab and many other provinces in India, Urdu is being used as the language of schools and Law Courts and administration in general. It has been argued that Urdu and Hindi must be combined to make one language which has now been given the name Hindustani. Nobody knows what the process of this combination is. Nobody knows how much Hindi in Hindustani there should be and how much Urdu. This percentage has never been fixed definitely. It is impossible to do so. About the script it is said that any one may use any script, either Devanagari or Persian. It must be noted clearly that other scripts of India like Bengali and Gujarati cannot be used for this purpose. It is absurd.

### STRANGERS IN OUR OWN LAND

Self-respect, self-determination, self-development and freedom, these are words which ultimately have to be used not in restricted part of our political life but on a very grand scale. Why should the Indian language be written in a

foreign script ? Why should we, who are proud of being Indian nationalists, use a Persian script ? Will that not mean a permanent shame and an infamy ? Foreign alphabets are used only by barbarians who possess no alphabet of their own. Shall we give this evidence to the posterity that we had no script of our own to write with ? Is it not a sad spectacle ?

Hindus, if you are not strong enough to convert the Mohammadians of this country to Indianism, why should you degrade yourself and be Persianised and Arabized yourself ?

As Indian nationalists, it is our duty to see that every resident of this land is proud of India and he should not be a party to India's slavery, in any sphere to any country. We must hang our heads in shame whenever young boys sing songs of the beauties of the Persian flowers, Persian birds, Persian heroes and know nothing of their own land. We are being made strangers in our own land. This process must be put an end to.

We must be strong enough at least to ordain for ourselves that no child of ours will be allowed to be Persianised or Arabized.

Let the Hindu child remain a pure Indian, so that in the making of our nation in the near future it should stand as the backbone of the nation.

—'Mahratta' 26-4-40

## INTRIGUES WITH HYDERABAD

"Peace in Waziristan can be restored if we set about improving the economic condition of those people," declares Mr. Abdul Qaiyum, M.L.A. (Central) in the course of a press statement.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum suggests that a large number of Tribal people should be recruited to the Indian army. He says, "if twenty thousand tribesmen are serving in our army they will not only be a source of a strength to us but we will have no danger of raids or kidnappings from their relatives at home. Surely they are better fighters than even the Gurkhas. I hope the Government of India will revise their policy regarding the tribes and a peaceful time will soon come."

—'Free Press Journal' 3-2-40



Sir Akbar Hyderi, President of the Nizam's Executive Council, had been on a tour to the North West Frontier Province of India. His tour to the Frontier as the representative of the Nizam, sent on his behalf to unveil the tablet associating the hostel of the Islamia College, Peshawar, with the Nizam's name, was in every sense a pompous demonstration organised by the Muslim Communalists.

A stream of deputations from various organisations greeted Sir Akbar at Amritsar and Lahore, while at the Peshawar Station the reception was unique both in its representative character and its members.



On the 11th Sir Akbar went to lunch with Nawab Saadullah Khan, 25 miles away from Peshawar, when Modin and tribesmen in thousands greeted him at various stages of the journey by road.

The function at the Islamia College saw the climax of the enthusiasm of the Moulavis and Muslim Communalists. The buildings and the roads were decorated with ancient Muslim architecture and green flags.

Sir Akbar Hyderi said in his speech, "Though Hyderabad is two thousand miles away from this place, yet we are very near and we are tied down by a common bond. Had not our relations been so mutually connected I would not have taken the trouble to traverse such a long distance. I sincerely hope to embrace you all as my kiths and kins only because I think that we are all connected by a sacred tie. The students of the Islamia College have to shoulder heavy responsibilities and I hope that they shall not shirk from that responsibility. You are the missionaries who are to preach and propagate Islam to the various tribes in India." He in the end referred to the dual role of the Frontier Muslims as the connecting link between the Muslims of India and the Muslim peoples across its frontiers and as the custodians of India's gate-way, the guardians of its inviolability.

Then followed a garden party where more than hundred and fifty prominent personalities were present. Sir Akbar Hyderi appreciated the Cosmopolitan spirit that could be seen owing to the presence of the persons following different faiths.

On the third day Sir Akbar visited the Khyber Pass with the Political Agent and went as far as the frontiers of India at Landi Khana, meeting with a warm welcome at different stages from the Afridi Khasadars and tribesmen.

He was given a guard of honour at Tarud Fort. He said his prayers at the famous mosques on the Frontier. He visited a gun factory and appreciated the demonstration of the firings of the crude guns.

The leader of the Afridi tribes, Mahomed Jamman Khan welcomed Sir Hyderi and they embraced each other. The leader said, "you are the intelligent link between the tribes on the Frontier and the Nizam's State. It is my urgent desire that the roads connecting the Frontier to the Hyderabad should be broad and straight. Our situation does not allow us to follow a definite policy. Yet I promise on behalf of my tribesmen to the Nizam that we are always at the service of His Exalted Highness." While giving a reply to this Sir Akbar said, "there is not a word that can express the joy that I feel when I see such active enthusiasts guarding the gate-way of India."

Before visiting Kohat, Sir Hyderi had a prolonged secret talk with the Moulavis at Peshawar in Mahabatkhan Mosque.

Similar scenes of enthusiasm were witnessed on the way to and at Kohat the following day. On the way back, streams of deputationists poured in at the railway stations and emphasised the close connection between the Muslims of the Punjab and the Nizam's State.

—'Maharatta' 22-3-40



Spectacular events in Indian politics have kept the visit of the Premier of the Nizam State to the Indo-Afghan frontier unnoticed. The mystery behind the visit remains concealed. People are talking that the Muslims of India, under the leadership of the Muslim League, are planning the establishment of the Muslim rule over the whole of India by making the Nizam its king. Sometime back Mr. Jinnah

paid a visit to the Nizam, talked with him for two hours about the Indian political problem, and refused to disclose the subject matter of their talk to the press. And now comes the bomb-shell in the form of the Nizam's Premier's visit to the Indo-Afghan border to visit India's gate-way in the North—the gate-way which joins the Muslim majority provinces in India with the Muslim States of North and North-West. We are informed by the Associated Press that, "Nawab Mahomed Jamman, Head of the Afridi tribe, is reported to have said that the presence of the Nizam's Premier in their midst gave them the greatest pleasure and he placed the entire resources and services of the Afridi tribe at the disposal of the Nizam and (further) said that with its acceptance the tribal area would be joined to the premier Muslim State in more than one country." These words are as clear as day-light. The Muslims seem to be thinking of stepping into the shoes of the weakening Britishers, establish Muslim raj in India, making the Nizam its Sultan, and joining it to Afghanistan, Iran and Turkey which have agreed to render mutual support. These seem to be the writings on the wall. Will Government of India and the Hindus take note of this?

—'Mahratta' 22-3-40

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

Nawab Bahadur Yar Jung, President of the All-India States Muslim League, in a recent speech commented on Mahatma Gandhi's article on 'Hyderabad' published in the 'Harijan'.

The Nawab said that the article contained the talk given by Gandhiji to the speaker on his way back from Delhi, and thought that if the demand to restore the territories was just as admitted by Mahatma Gandhi "it is yet to be

enquired of him whether equity is a different variety from justice."

Proceeding the Nawab said, "As to the choice of the people of the Ceded areas they were not consulted when the territories were taken away from Hyderabad. Moreover Mahatma Gandhi himself stated in his article that he preferred anarchy to foreign rule.

"Why should he not then advise the people of these territories which we demand back to agitate to return to an orderly Indian rule? The other questions are domestic." The speaker endorsed Mahatma Gandhi that the king is a servant of the people but he is not in the Gandhian term a helpless monarch or a mere puppet at the beck and call of the legislature.

The Islamic conception is that of a full-fledged and all-powerful Khalif who derives divine power from the people.

—'Mahratta' 29-11-40



### GANDHIJI on HYDERABAD

"What do you say to the right of Hyderabad to the territories that have been taken away by the English under some pretext or other, e. g. Berar, Ceded Districts, Karnatak etc.?"

This question demands an answer. So far as they have been taken away by the English, the right accrues against the English. If I am asked as a matter of equity, I can only say that the people of the respective parts should be asked to make their choice. That is the only equity I know.

But I suggest that all such discussion is academic. If India, the geographical unit, gets independence, as it must some day, it means that every component part has its in-

dependence. If independence is won non-violently, all the component parts will be voluntarily interdependent working in perfect harmony under a representative central authority which will derive its sanction from the confidence reposed in it by the component parts. If independence is taken by force of arms, then the strongest power will hold sway over all India. And this may be Hyderabad for aught I know. All the big and the petty States will be free willynilly from the British yoke. They will each fight for their existence and succumb to the strongest who will be the Emperor of India. This presupposes unarmed millions lying prostrate at the feet of the combination of armed States. Many other things are, however, conceivable. The Indian part of the British army will probably have consciousness of strength and an independent existence. There may be Muslim arms, Sikh arms, Gurkha arms, Rajput arms and what not. They may fight among themselves, or, having allied themselves to some nationalist party, may present a united front to the Princes. There may also be the descent upon India of the warring tribes from the Frontier to share the spoils or the sovereignty itself.

The Congress, if it still has anything of its nonviolence left in it, will die in the attempt to establish universal peace in India. It is not impossible that all the warring elements will find it profitable in more ways than one voluntarily to surrender themselves to the moral authority of a central power. This means universal suffrage exercised by a disciplined and politically intelligent electorate. It also means a decent and permanent burial to communal and other discord.

But this may not happen. The existing state of things does not warrant an optimistic outlook. But I am a man of faith. And to faith all things are possible. But supposing



the worst happens and there is anarchy in the land, if there is God upon earth as He is in heaven, then you may depend upon it that I shall not live to make any choice. I shall die in the anarchic flame whilst I am vainly attempting to still it with my tiny, shaky hands. But if you ask me in advance whether I would face anarchy in preference to foreign orderly rule, either British or any other, I would unhesitatingly plump for anarchy, say, the rule of the Nizam supported by Chiefs become feudatory to him or supported by the border Muslim tribes. In my estimation it will be cent per cent domestic. It will be home rule though far, far from self-rule or swa-raj (स्व-राज). But you must let me repeat that, while I can write thus academically, if the reality faces me, my choice will be death or the rule of the people by the people for the people. This means the rule of unadulterated non-violence. So you see my non-violence is made not of cotton wool but of a metal much harder than steel and yet softer than cotton wool. You can compare it only with itself.

You will naturally then ask what place have the Princes in my scheme of things. Such a question should not arise if you had fully realized the implications of non-violence. For, the Princes obeying the moral authority of a central body not sustained by arms will find an honourable place as servants of the people. No one will have any rights but what are inherent in a willing performance of one's duties. Thus H. E. H. the Nizam will then be the chosen servant of people. Only, then, his people will not be merely those confined willynilly within his present borders but may be all India. You must not dismiss this as a utopian scheme. I claim to be a practical man. If the Congress proves true to its policy, what may seem today to be an airy nothing, may tomorrow become an agreeable reality. In my scheme

there is no waste of either human talent or creative effort. Let me quote here my cable to H. G. Wells in reply to his on the Rights of Man :

“ Received your cable. Have carefully read your five articles. You will permit me to say, you are on the wrong track. I feel sure that I can draw up a better charter of rights than you have drawn up. But what good will it be ? Who will become its guardian ? If you mean propaganda or popular education, you have begun at the wrong end. I suggest the right way. Begin with a charter of Duties of Man, and I promise the rights will follow as spring follows winter. I write from experience. As a young man I began life by seeking to assert my rights, and I soon discovered I had none—not even over my wife. So I began by discovering and performing my duty by my wife, my children, friends, companions and society, and I find today that I have greater rights, perhaps, than any living man I know. If this is too tall a claim, then I say I do not know anyone who possesses greater rights than I. ”

Sevagram, 8-10-40

--‘Harijan’ 13-10-40.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆  
Barr. SAVARKAR on HYDERABAD

Under the caption ‘ Hyderabad ’ Gandhiji has recently written an article in the ‘ Harijan ’ dated the 13th October 1940, purported to be a reply to a real or fancied correspondent who wanted to know what Gandhiji thought of the “ Right of Hyderabad to the Territories of Berar, Ceded Districts, Karnatak, etc., which had been taken away by the British under some pretext or the other. ”

It is not any special merit which attaches to this article but it is the mischievous effect, it is sure to produce on the

Moslem public mind by inciting them to press on the Pakistan movement with added zeal that the article must be brought to the notice of the Hindu public and condemned forthwith.

From the trend of the article, it is clear that the article is deliberately meant by Gandhiji to goad the Muslims on to continue the Pakistan movement with greater confidence in as much as he extends in the course of the article a covert support and holds before the eyes of the Muslim fanaticism an assurance that if but the Muslims dare to strike in time to establish a Moslem Empire in India, the move is very likely to succeed and could be in a way morally and politically justified.

We have it on the evidence of no less reliable an authority than Swami Shraddhanandji himself that after the last Anglo-Afghan War of 1919, Gandhiji abetted the treacherous move on the part of the Moslem leaders to invite the Amir Amanullah of Afghanistan to invade India again. Mr. A. J. Karandikar has recently written a series of articles in the 'Kesari' and the 'Mahratta' quoting chapter and verse, and proved it to the hilt that the charge was true.

Even recently time and again Gandhiji and his Congressite henchmen have stated it covertly and overtly that if the Moslems are bent upon cutting India piecemeal and convert parts of it into purely Moslem Raj, no power could stop them from doing so and these Congressite patriots would not hesitate to subject themselves to this would-be Pakistan as that also would be an Indian Rule.

If we take into consideration, in addition to this, the contact Gandhiji has been trying to establish with the Frontier Tribes for several years by sending out his trusted emissaries like Miraben, Perinben, Bhulabhai, Asafbhai and a number of other Bens and Bhais to woo the Pathans and plead their



cause that it is the economic and moral starvation alone which has compelled these poor Frontier Tribes, whom Gandhiji styles as 'God-fearing', to take to such 'legitimate' means of securing relief as looting, kidnapping, abducting, forcibly converting and murdering the Hindu men and women in the Frontier districts,—when we take into consideration all these activities, past and present, of Gandhist group and then read this article written by Gandhiji, no shred of doubt could be left in the mind of any clear-sighted Hindu reader as to the fact that Gandhi and his Congressite Hindu followers are about to play once again the same mischief; they would not hesitate to help the Moslem in the treacherous plot of Pakistan which they are already hatching to re-establish Moslem suzerainty in India, either by compelling the Hindus to acquiesce in a constitution after the Pakistan model under British pressure or by resorting to an armed revolution in case the British are perchance compelled by a crushing defeat in the World War to leave India and no new invader steps in.

If a correspondent has really asked Gandhiji what he thought about the 'Right' of Hyderabad to the restitution of the Ceded territories and believed that if but the equity of the case is certified under the sign and seal of the Shegaon tribunal the British Government would forthwith restore the territories to the Nizam, he must be a simpleton indeed. It is steel and gun-powder that decide the restitution of Kingdoms! But in spite of it all, Gandhiji seriously goes on arguing the silly question as seriously as it was asked and delivers his judgment to the effect, "So far as the territories have been taken away by the English, the right accrues against the English."

Now, making allowance for the fact that Gandhiji knows as little of Indian History as of Hebrew, he should have

known at least this much about the case, he so seriously argues that the Ceded territories were ceded by the Nizam to the English in return of the protection which the English offered him against the conquering Mahratta forces.

The Mahrattas had well-nigh finished the Nizam at Kharda and he knew that he would soon be standing as a prisoner at the gate of the Peshwas in Poona, where his Vazir was already undergoing the same fate, if he did not call in the English to protect him. The other territories were conquered by the English from the Nizam by the right of the sword.

But, if perchance Gandhiji refuses to recognise any right which is based on the conquest by sword as right at all, then instead of asking the English to restore the conquered and Ceded territories to the Nizam, Gandhiji must ask the Nizam to evacuate even the territories which he possesses at present for the simple reason that he usurped the whole Dominion from the Moghul Emperor who had appointed the Nizam as his Governor, by an armed revolt against his own Master.

Nay, if the right of the conquest by sword is out of court altogether then the first rightful owner who could be ascertained at present and to whom the whole territory, the Nizam possesses as well as the ceded districts etc., ought to be restored straight,—is the Maharaja of Vijayanagar! For, it was his ancestors who were the rightful owners of that Kingdom before the Moslem hoards “came with iron hands and from our Fathers snatched the Land.”

But leaving this question of “right” aside, Gandhiji proceeds, “If I am asked as a matter of equity, I can only state that the people of the respective parts, that is, Berar, Ceded Districts, Karnatak, etc., should be asked to make their

choice, that is the only equity I know." Now, no one can have any objection to this pleasant platitude but for the fact that it is resorted to as a subterfuge to shirk the risk of telling the whole truth. The real bone of contention in such a matter is bound to be, how to ascertain this choice of the people.

If Gandhiji was serious in holding up the democratic principle then instead of stopping short with this innocuous platitude he should have unequivocally stated that the people's choice must be determined by the majority vote. But he knew the fact that the majority, not only of the Ceded Districts but of even the Nizam State itself being Hindus, a free plebiscite was bound to call upon the Nizam to clear out of the State altogether and any clear statement on the part of Gandhiji holding up the right of the Hindu majority would have consequently angered the Moslems whom in the latter part of the article he wanted to please in particular.

That is why he stopped short of telling the truth. The fraternity of soothsayers through all ages, who swear that they tell nothing but truth has had always to resort to the subterfuge of telling half truths which are often worse than lies, whenever they want to avoid the risk of telling the real truth and yet save their reputation as truth-tellers.

Not satisfied with only answering the question asked by the correspondent regarding the right of the Nizam to have the ceded and other districts only, Gandhiji utilises the occasion to enter into a digression totally unconnected with the original question. After beating about the bush a great deal regarding the different possibilities of the future development of Indian political situation and after assuming a number of absurdities he comes to the conclusion that in case the British power is overthrown in India as the result of the war and in case no other non-Indian world-power steps immediately in the shoes of Britain to rule India which con-

sequently would be left in the throes of an internal anarchy, "the strongest power in the Land will hold sway over all India and this," Gandhiji avers, "may be Hyderabad for ought I know. All other big and petty chiefs will ultimately succumb to the strongest power of the Nizam who will be the Emperor of India."

But what will be the role of the Congress and Gandhiji himself under these circumstances? According to Gandhiji "the poor Congress if it is true to its creed of non-violence will die." Quite a sound view, that such a body devoted to such a creed can be blessed with no other fate! Even Gandhiji, who says in the article, "I am a man of faith and to a man of faith nothing is impossible," admits that the Congress future is dark! "The existing state of things does not warrant any optimistic outlook."

But Gandhiji will not feel quite out of sorts even if the Congress dies and such an anarchy sets in.

For says he, "If you ask me in advance whether I would face anarchy to foreign orderly rule, either British or any other I would unhesitatingly plump for anarchy, say, the rule of the Nizam supported by the chiefs become feudatory to him or supported by the border Moslem tribes. 'Because' Gandhiji pointedly observes, "in my estimation such a rule, —under the Nizam raised to be the Emperor of India by reducing all other Hindu chiefs to his feudatories with the help of the border Moslem tribes—such a rule will be cent per cent domestic. It will be Home Rule."

....And after all this, Gandhiji adds "But this is all academic!!"

Geographically speaking, Aurangzeb too was born and bred in India. But was his Rule on that account looked upon by the Hindus as 'Home Rule'? No. It was on the contrary hated by them as a veritable hell and the rule of any Moslem

conqueror in future is bound to be similarly hated and overthrown by a new Shivaji or Bajirao or Ranjeet.

For this reason and also from the Ahimsak point of view, we sincerely request Gandhiji that it will be more in keeping with the principle of Ahimsa that he should not compromise with either logic or reason or circumstances or even with destiny. He himself has averred that he is a man of faith and to a man of faith like him nothing is impossible. Then why not once for all make it 'possible' to have the Ahimsak Empire itself firmly established in India at a stroke of 'faith'? Fortunately for us, there is Vinoba Bhave at hand who with the spinning-wheel is doubtless better fitted as the first Ahimsak Emperor of India than a Nizam bristling with spears, swords and guns from top to toe.

But the insurmountable difficulty which perhaps might have rendered Vinoba Bhave ineligible to this high honour seems to be the fact that after all he still continues to be Hindu and no Moslem can ever submit to a Hindu Rule. But as Hindus, at any rate, those of the non-violent school can but only feel honoured to tender subjection to a Moslem Rule and as it is impossible to find a Moslem dedicated to non-violence, Gandhiji was perhaps left with no choice but to offer the Crown to His Exalted Highness the Nizam.

Be that as it may we cannot refrain ourselves from offering a friendly suggestion to the Nizam that he should think twice before he allows His Exalted head to get swollen with any such quixotic ambition as the Pakistani Moslems and the few Hindus of masochistic Gandhi-breed may goad him on to indulge in.

Last time these very Gandhi-Azads along with the Khilafatists persuaded Amanullah the Amir to believe that he was the God-appointed heir—apparent to the Indian throne.

As Fate would have it, Batcha-i-Sakka, the son of a water-carrier finished him. This time the very ill-omened Gandhist group joining hands with the Pakistani Moslems, is trying to goad on the poor Nizam to bid for the Crown of Indian Empire. May God save him from a similar coming fate !

Although Gandhiji being a man of 'faith' could afford to be unconscious in the course of his article that there is some such political factor in India as the Hindu people to be taken into account ; and although the Nizam and the Frontier tribes are on his brain as the only living forces in India, yet the Nizam at least must be knowing, at any rate after the Hindu Civil Resistance Movement of last year that the Hindu Sanghatan Movement constitutes a second and a challenging factor in Indian politics today and is growing daily from strength to strength.

If such an anarchy as Gandhiji takes for granted in his article, does ever set in, leaving Hindus and the Moslems face to face in India, there cannot now be even the ghost of a chance for the Nizam to make his way to the Indian imperial throne, even if all the Frontier tribes are expected to come down to Hyderabad *en masse* to support him.

Just as the article in the 'Harijan' has told us the academical forecast of the masochistic school of Gandhist Hindus, even so the virile Hindu Sanghatanist also has weighed out his academical prospects. The Hindu Sanghatanist takes into account the millions of Hindus from Kashmere to the Cape, who are being animated by the pan-Hindu spirit.

He knows the hour of Hindu resurrection has already struck, and the very dead bones of our heroic forefathers, even the very Hindu Princes, have stirred up with new life and impulse. They cannot long remain unconcerned, if the Moslem Princes threaten a nation-wide Civil War.

The foremost of the Hindu Princes have realised that if Hindudom falls, the Hindu States too must fall with it. As defenders of Hindu faith and Hindu honour they form the reserved forces of Hindudom, organised centres of Hindu strength which even today will outweigh by far the utmost which a Hyderabad here or a Bhopal there can do to spite the Hindu cause.

From Udeipur, Jodhpur, Jaipur, Gwalior, Indore, Dhar, Dewas, Baroda to Kolhapur, it is almost an unbroken chain of Hindu Military camps of organised Hindu Governments, which animated by the new Hindu spirit, cannot but come forward in their own interests as well as those of Hindudom as a whole to defend the Hindu cause. Even Scindia alone, other things being equal, can smash up the Nizam on any new Udgir or Kharda field he chooses. Pressed by these overwhelming Hindu forces from the North and those of the Mysore, Travancore and Cochin in the South, the poor Nizam will simply be sandwiched between them and instead of winning back the ceded districts will have, on the contrary to cede whatever districts he already possesses today. There will not be left a trace of Moslem Rule from the Seas in the South to the Jamuna in the North.

But what of the Frontier tribes and Islamic Kingdoms outside India which are expected to help the 'faithful' in India to bring into being a new Moslem Empire—the Pakistan ?

Well, let the Pakistan alone,—the few '*Sthanas*' like your Afghanistan, Arbastan and even Turkastan are themselves getting thrown into a melting pot and they will have to thank their stars if they can help only themselves to survive the European onslaught. Even Nadirshahas and Ahamadshahas could not save the Moghul Empire of the 'faithfuls' in India in the heyday of their power from

being overthrown by the Hindus ! What can the puny descendants of them today do to retrieve the loss ?

So far as the Frontier tribes are concerned, they will have first to settle their account with our heroic Sikh brotherhood before they cross the Ravi !

And when all is said and done there still remains the most deciding factor which of all other factors is most likely to settle the future destiny of India in case such an anarchy as we are discussing sets in. It is the independent Hindu Kingdom of Nepal where a hundred thousand up-to-date Hindu rifles stand marshalled out ready to spit fire and vengeance in defence of Hindu Honour at a signal from their chief and every hut nestles the breed of Hindu warriors. Any Moslem rising with a view to political domination of India whether in the South, North or on the Frontier is bound to affect Nepal as the Defender of the Hindu Faith and the commander of Hindu forces. She cannot let the chance slip out of her hand to make a bid for the Imperial throne of Hindusthan even in her self preservation. As things stand, it would be a simple walk-over for her through Bihar, Bengal to Assam in the East and the Indus to the West. Any opposition on the part of, say, Mr. Huq with his Noakhali Goondas or the rabbles of Khaksars with only spades to shoulder can no more stop the onward march of the organised up-to-date forces of Independent Nepal strengthened by millions of Hindu Sanghatanists from all parts of India rallying round their Hindu flag, than a mount of sand can stem the angry tides of stormy sea.

Even Gandhiji dare not deny that the Imperial Rule of the Hindu King of Nepal can be at least as much a "Cent per cent Domestic Rule, a Veritable Home Rule" as the sway of a Nizam seems to him to be !



If an academical probability is at all to be indulged in, of all factors that count today, His Majesty the King of Nepal, the scion of the Shisodias, alone has the best chance of winning the Imperial crown of India. Strange as it may seem, the English know it better than we Hindus do. So shrewd a politician and historian as Persival Langdon himself writes in the end of his voluminous work on Nepal:—"The fact is that the communal strife from one end of India to the other invests Nepal with an importance that it would be foolish to overlook."

"Englishmen should attempt to understand the high position which Nepal holds in the Southern Asiatic balance and the great and growing importance which she will possess in the future in the solution of the problems which beset the present state of India. Nepal stands today on the threshold of a new life. Her future calls her in one direction and one only. It is not impossible that Nepal may even be called upon to control the destiny of India itself."

Even Britain will feel it more graceful that the Sceptre of Indian Empire, if it ever slips out of her grip, should be handed over to an equal and independent ally of Britain like His Majesty the King of Nepal than to one who is but a vassal and a vanquished potentate of Britain like the Nizam.

But we also repeat that all this is academic meant only to serve a virile antidote to the inferiority complex which the spineless academical forecast of Gandhiji betrays.

And yet, if but the Hindus realise and take stock of the inexhaustible resources of strength they have still at hand relatively to the Indian Moslems, resurvey them from a pan-Hindu angle of vision and take the field in time, they will find that much that sounds academic today could even be made actual and the racial dream of a consolidated, mighty and independent Nation could be realised sooner than they dare to expect!

## SURRENDER TO MUSLIMS

Gandhiji is an expert in the science of surrender and the Indian Muslims are shrewd enough to gather fruits of his surrender. We are not speaking in an ironical vein, Gandhiji himself has written an article on 'the Science of Surrender' in 'Young India,' 9-7-1925, in which he says, "What a lover gives transcends justice. And yet it is always less than he wishes to give because he is anxious to give more and frets that he has nothing left." The public might well be aware of the fact that Gandhiji was prepared to give a 'blank cheque' to Indian Muslims at the Second Round Table Conference. But neither he nor the Muslims were satisfied with that gift. And hence Gandhiji has gone another step further on the path of surrender and is pledging the support of the Congress for the establishment of 'Muslim Raj' in India. The readers must not think that we are making baseless allegations. Gandhiji himself writes in 'Harijan' of 23-3-40, "It is the Muslims who will impose their will by force singly or with British assistance on an unresisting India. If I can carry the Congress with me I would not put the Muslims to the trouble of using force. I would be ruled by them for it would still be Indian rule." Now that Gandhiji has become the sole dictator of the Congress there is no question of the Congress going against him. Even in 1921 'The Citizen' an organ of the Liberals of Madras wrote in a prophetic vein, "The Ahmedabad Congress has made Mr. Gandhi dictator. Democracy may now hide its diminished head in shame. The thing was bound to come, history could not but repeat

itself. And a dictator today would become a traitor to-morrow. Circumstances are also tending in that direction."

The prophecy of the Madras Liberals is now being fulfilled. Gandhiji is travelling the path from dictatorship to treachery. The incipient dictator is turning out to be a Hindu Quisling. And this Hindu edition of the Norwegian original might prove to be more dangerous, on account of his power of hypnotising the masses. In a recent article on Hyderabad in 'Harijan,' 13-10-40 he says, "Thus H. E. H. the Nizam, will then be the chosen servant of people. Only then, his people will not be merely those continued willynilly within his present borders but may be all India. You must not dismiss this as a utopian scheme. I claim to be a practical man. If the Congress proves true to its policy, what may seem today to be an airy nothing may tomorrow become an agreeable reality." Gandhiji recognises that Nizam's rule will mean anarchy in India. Yet he unhesitatingly plumps for that anarchy. This preference for anarchy has a metaphysical reason behind it which is explained by Gandhiji in 'Harijan,' 7-10-1939 as follows: "I hold that for full play of non-violence only one party need believe in it. Indeed if both believe in it and live upto it there is no appreciation or demonstration of it. To live at peace with one another is the most natural thing to do. But neither party gains the merit that the exercise of non-violence carries with it."

From the above passage it will be clear that in order to gain spiritual merit for himself he is ready to plunge the whole country in a bloodbath. The responsible leaders of the country should consider whether they are prepared to stake the life of our nation for the idiocrasies of a Mahatma. The Hindus should realise that the role that is cast for them in the mad experiments of the Mahatma, is that of a non-violent victim. Gandhiji expresses in the same article

that "My principal work lies through teaching at least the Hindus to learn the art of non-violence." According to Gandhiji's philosophy it is better for the masses to be invaded by a foreign army than to be defended by a national army. And this is not a joke. For the ex-President of Gandhi Seva Sangh Mr. Mashruwala himself has written in 'Harijan' 4-11-1939, "The masses have really less to fear from invading armies than from the country's own armies." We suspect that the 'Gandhi Seva Sangh' is a factory for manufacturing Quislings. Even the much-maligned Machiavelli has remarked that "Peace is more burdensome for men that are enslaved than war is for men that are free." Gandhiji's scheme of non-violent defence of India is a natural corollary of the absurd proposition of Mr. Mashruwala. Fortunately for us the leading members of the Congress Working Committee do not believe in the above theory. But they do not realise the tragic consequences of following Gandhiji in spite of their disbelief in non-violence. For Gandhiji himself has declared in 'Harijan,' 14-10-1939, "So far as I can read the Working Committee's mind after a fairly full discussion, the members think that Congressmen are unprepared for non-violent defence against armed invasion. The tragedy of the situation is that if the Congress is to throw in its lot with those who believe in the necessity of armed defence of India the past 20 years will have been years of gross neglect of the primary duty of Congressmen to learn the science of armed warfare. And I fear that history will hold me as the general of the fight responsible for the tragedy. The future historian will say that I should have perceived that the nation was learning not non-violence of the strong but merely passivity of the weak and I should have therefore provided for Congressmen's military training. Being obsessed with the idea that somehow or other India will learn true

non-violence it would not occur to me to invite my co-workers to train themselves for armed defence. Nor am I even now repentant for the past." Being conscious of having emasculated the Hindus by his teaching Gandhiji is now preparing to hand us over to the insecure custody of Nizam, supported by the wild border tribes.

Even Gandhiji has some lucid moments in which he is conscious of the tragic consequences of his policy. During his fast of 1924, Mr. Mahadeo Desai asked him where his error lay for which he was doing that penance. To this question Gandhiji replied, "My error? Why, I may be charged with having committed a breach of faith with the Hindus. I asked them to lay their lives and property at the disposal of the Mussalmans for the protection of their holy places. Even today I am asking them to practise Ahimsa to settle quarrels by dying but not killing. And what do I find to be the result? How many temples have been desecrated? How many sisters came to me with complaint? As I was saying yesterday to Hakimji, Hindu women are in mortal error of Mussalman goondas. In many places they fear to go out alone. I had a letter from.....How can I bear the way in which his little children were molested? How can I now ask the Hindus to put up with every thing patiently? I gave them the assurance that the friendship of Mussalmans was bound to bear good fruit. I asked them to befriend them regardless of the result. It is not in my power today to make good that assurance. Who listens to me? And yet I must ask the Hindus even today to die and not to kill. I can only do so by laying down my life." If he had died at that time we would have been rid of this pernicious canker eating into the vitals of the Hindu society.

Really speaking we do not understand why this Mahatma is so insistent on prescribing us non-violence. He does not

disbelieve in the right of might. He himself has declared in the "Science of Surrender." 'Might is right' is the last word of 'justice and nothing but justice.' This is not an off-hand statement. For, in 'Harijan' 21-10-39 he says, "The question therefore resolves itself into not who is numerically superior but who is stronger. Surely there is only one answer." It is because he believes in the strength of the Muslims that he is preaching the justice of Nizam's cause. We do not think that the Muslims are a match to the Hindus in any sense. Let there be a fair trial of strength between the Muslims and the Hindus unhampered by this pernicious doctrine of surrender and non-violence. Gandhiji also at one time believed in such a fair trial of strength. In 'Young India' 18-9-24 he says, "I hate duelling, but it has a romantic side to it. I am engaged in bringing that side of it to the fore. I would love to engage in a duel with the Big Brother. When we are both satisfied that there is no chance of Unity without bloodshed and that even we two, cannot agree to live in peace, I must then invite the Big Brother to a duel with me. I know that he can twist me round his thick fingers and dash me to pieces. That day Hinduism will be free. Or if he lets me kill him in spite of the strength of a giant, Islam in India will be free. He will have atoned for all the bullying by the average Musalman. What I detest is the match between goondas of both the parties. Any peace based upon such trial of strength will turn to bitterness in the end. The way to get rid of the Hindu cowardice is for the educated portion to fight the goondas. We may use sticks and other clean weapons. My Ahimsa will allow the use of them. We shall be killed in the fight but that will chasten both the Hindus and the Musalmans. That would remove the Hindu cowardice in a moment. As things are going each party will be the slaves of their own goondas.

That means dominance of the military power. England fought for the predominance of the civil power and won and lived. Lord Curzon did much harm to us. But he was certainly brave and right when he stood out for the predominance of civil authority. When Rome passed into the hands of the soldiery, it fell. My whole soul rises against the very idea of the custody of my religion passing into the hands of the goondas. Confining myself therefore for the present to the Hindus I must respectfully but earnestly warn the thinking Hindus against relying upon the assistance of goondas for the protection of their temples, themselves and their wives and children. With the weak bodies they have they must be determined to stand at their post and to die fighting or without fighting." While Gandhiji was thus earnestly advising the educated Hindus to organise for self-defence another great Hindu leader, Dr. Hedgewar of Nagpur tried to put this precept into practice by organising the wellknown "Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh." And yet Gandhiji has been ignoring this institution started with the avowed purpose of doing away with Hindu cowardice and strengthening the bonds of unity among the Hindus.

While stating the reasons of the weakness of Hindus in spite of their being in a majority Gandhiji in 'Harijan' 21-10-39, says, "Hinduism is an elastic, indefinable term and Hindus are not a homogeneous whole like Muslims and Christians." This statement betrays Gandhiji's gross ignorance of the latest movements for the regeneration of Hinduism. Hinduism is not an elastic and indefinable term but something positive and definite. Barr. Savarkar has clearly defined it, and Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh has clearly demonstrated that though divided by castes and creeds the Hindus are a homogeneous whole. As these facts have been proved, it is time for the Hindus to shed their inferiority complex.

Here we must draw the attention of the readers to a very important point. In his article on Hyderabad, Gandhiji has declared that 'the rule of the Nizam supported by the border Muslim tribes or chiefs feudatory to him would, in his estimation, be cent per cent domestic. It would be Home Rule.' Gandhiji's numerous followers are telling us on every occasion that they are willing to accept Muslim rule in India. But do they really know what Muslim rule means in practice? The Muslims in India are incapable to rule this vast country without Muslim help from outside. So, in practice, Muslim rule will mean, not the rule of the Indian Muslims but of those recruited from outside. This fact is, well illustrated by a reference to Akbar's so called national administration. W. H. Morland in an economic survey of India at the death of Akbar writes, "The service was not by any means confined to men of Indian Nationality and in Akbar's time it was predominantly foreign. The approximate composition of the service under Akbar can be ascertained from Blochmann's labourious notes to lists of Amirs and Mansabdars given by Abul Fazal; these lists include all appointments made during the reign to the ranks above 500, and also those holders of inferior rank who were alive when the 'Ain' was compiled about 1595. Omitting the small number of officers whose origin is not on record, I find that just under 70% of the remainder belonged to families which had either come to India with Humayun or had arrived at court after the accession of Akbar; the remaining 30% of the appointments were made by Indians rather more than half by Muslims and rather less than half by Hindus. Akbar has often been praised for the enlightened policy which offered such scope for advancement to his Hindu subjects and the praise is deserved provided that proper stress is laid on the element of policy. In the course of about 40 years he appointed in all 21 Hindus



to ranks above 500 but of these 17 were R<sup>aj</sup>puts. That is to say that a great majority of the appointments were made to consolidate his hold over the chiefs who submitted to his rule."

It has been established how Muslim rule is really foreign rule as regards the governing element. Now we shall prove how this rule will be entirely foreign so far as ideals and traditions are concerned. The anonymous Muslim author of 'The Confederacy of India' says "Ordinarily the formation of the Indusstan Federation may constitute a very attractive idea for the Muslims but perhaps it would be shorn of all its attractiveness if we were to explain to them all its implications and consequences. A Muslim state may not mean a state in the Western sense of the word to which the Indian Muslims have become accustomed. It may mean the purging of the Indian Muslims of all the un-Islamic influences which they have contracted on account of their close contact with the non-Muslim communities in India. It may also mean the establishment of a Bait-ul-mal and regular payment of zakat into it. It may as well require the Muslim agriculturists to forgo the protection which the Land Alienation Act provides to them in the Punjab and the N. W. F. Province against expropriation at the hands of the non-agricultural tribes. It may require some Muslim communities of Sind like Khojas and Kachhi Memons to give up the Hindu Law and instead be governed by the Mahomedan Law and of the Punjab to discard customary law and instead apply to themselves the Muslim Law of inheritance. It may mean many other things to which the Muslims may not be prepared. By mentioning this aspect of the proposed federation we do not mean to terrify the Muslims at its prospect. We refer to it simply in the interests of honest presentation of the subject and to point

out to them the fact that they have considerably wandered away from Islam." This appalling prospect of de-Indianisation is repellant to the ordinary Indian Muslims themselves. Yet their fanatical leaders are determined to force the Islamic Law in all its primitive ruthlessness upon their helpless followers. If the Muslim leaders can exhibit such utter callousness as regards the feelings of their co-religionists, what hope is there, of their being more considerate in dealing with the Hindus, whom they are pleased to call Kaffirs. The notorious 'Muslim Outlook' of Lahore, has already expressed its hope that the future Muslim rulers of India would continue the good work begun by Sultan Mahamud of Ghazni and Aurangzeb.

Before closing we must bring to the notice of the readers a remarkable criticism of Syed Abdul Latif's scheme by the anonymous Muslim author of 'The Confederacy of India' 'The author has conveniently closed his eyes to a few realities, namely, the All India National Congress and the well awakened Hindu Community while suggesting that a long strip of the country extending to the port of Madras and a large area around Calcutta which are prominently Hindu tracts, may be included in the Muslim Zones of Hyderabad and Bengal respectively.' The sequel has proved that the Syed of Hyderabad was asking too little instead of too much when such a champion of surrender was leading (or shall we say misleading) the Indian National Congress.

## SHRADDHANAND versus GANDHIJI

### SHAUKAT ALI'S PRANKS

[In this passage Swami Shraddhanand reveals how Shaukat Ali was preparing the ground for the final abandonment of non-violence.]

There is one particular fact about Maulana Shaukat Ali's doings, which I must relate here. Sitting on the dias in the Calcutta Special Session, Maulana Shaukat Ali, in the hearing of more than 50 persons, while the merits of non-violence were being discussed, said "Mahatma Gandhi is a shrewd Bania. You do not understand his real object. By putting you under discipline, he is preparing you for Guerilla warfare. He is not such an out-and-out **non-violent** as you all suppose." I was shocked to hear all this from the big brother and remonstrated with him which he treated with humour. I had no occasion to talk to Mahatma Gandhi about it at Calcutta. Next came the ordinary session at Nagpur which I attended. There too I noticed the big Ali playing the same pranks. On that occasion I wanted to warn Mahatma Gandhi but unfortunately I was attacked with influenza and could not join the last sitting of the Session. Still I wrote to Mahatmaji telling of my inability to go to him and asked him to come to me because I had an important communication to make. He also pleaded his inability to get off from deputations from different provinces who came to see him and sent his Secretary, Shriyut Mahadeva Desai, instead. I gave him my message to Gandhiji saying that he ought to be on his guard because his motives were being misrepresented by his trusted colleagues. There was another prominent fact to which I drew the attention of Mahatma Gandhi. Both of us went together one night to the Khilafat

Conference at Nagpur. The Ayats (verses) of the Quran recited by Maulanas on that occasion contained frequent references to Jihad against and the killing of Kaffirs. But when I drew his attention to this phase of the Khilafat movement Mahatmaji smiled and said,

“ They are alluding to the British bureaucracy.”

In reply I said that it was all subversive of the ideal of non-violence and when a revulsion of feeling came, the Mohammadan Maulanas would not refrain from using these verses against the Hindus.

—‘The Liberator’ 22-7-26



### HISTORY OF THE WIRE TO AMANULLAH

In the middle of April 1921 when I was allowed by my medical adviser to leave my bed, to which I had been confined for three months and a half, they admonished me not to walk more than two furlongs a day, to lie down for rest as much as possible and not to undertake long night journeys. But the marriage of Pandit Motilal Nehru’s daughter was to be celebrated in the beginning of May and all the Hindu and Muslim leaders were to be there. I could not absent myself and therefore went to Delhi first, from which place I started for Allahabad. I broke journey at Cawnpore and I mention this because I spoke there in a public meeting and exhorted non-violent non-co-operators not to nurse the thought of getting Swaraja within 12 months because if disappointed there might set in a reaction which would prostrate the whole nation for scores of years. I asked them to fight the battle of freedom to the very end and make proper preparations for it.

The next day I left for Allahabad by the Punjab Howrah Mail. Maulana Muhammad Ali was also travelling by the

same train and I got in his compartment. Our talk centred round the topic of the day. Sir William Vincent (then Home Member of the Government of India) had repeated from his safe place in the Legislative Assembly that he had documentary proofs shewing that Mr. Muhammad Ali was corresponding with the Kabul Government against the British. During that very period a second class leader of the moderate liberal party—because all of them were leaders ; there were no followers—told me that a letter intercepted by the C. I. D. was actually shown to Dr. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru purporting to have been written by Mr. Muhammad Ali. I gave the whole thing in the press and challenged the Government to publish a fascimile of the same in the papers so that the public might have an occasion to judge whether the letter was in the handwriting of Mr. Muhammad Ali at all. On his enquiring about the language in which the letter in dispute was written, I told him that it was alleged to be in Persian. M. Muhammad Ali exclaimed “ Then it could not be written by me. I am not only innocent of Arabic but cannot write a letter in correct Persian. Urdu poet though I am of some worth.” I could not then understand how a man, innocent of both the Arabic and the Persian language could obtain the degree of Maulana, but the riddle was solved when I read the following in the open letter addressed to Musalmans by the late Maulana Abdul Bari of Lucknow, the declared Murshid of the Ali Brothers. At page 35 he wrote :—

“ The diploma (sanad ) of Maulana, which has been awarded to brother Maulana Muhammad Ali from Firangi Mahal was given on account of his discharge of duties of Tabligh ( Conversions ). In the Amritsar ( Congress ) Meeting, when all the topmost Hindu leaders were present, he gave the message of Islam by name to each one of them and moreover he gave the message of Islam to the Viceroy and through Lord Chelmsford to king George V. This was the

**duty of the Real Ulema (learned). When he (Maulana Muhammad Ali) discharged this duty on a grand scale, then from this place (Firangi Mahal) this title of exalted office was presented to him."**

It is a different matter, altogether, whether Mr. Muhammad Ali did really give the message of Islam to every topmost Hindu leader at Amritsar; but when I asked Pandit Nehru and Malviya, the late lamented Deshbandhu C. R. Das and Mr. C. Vijayaraghavachariar and others, they denied having been addressed on this subject by the neo-Maulana. But these might have no place among the topmost Hindu leaders in the eyes of this Maulana. I, therefore, enquired of Mahatma Gandhi and he too denied having been personally approached by brother Muhammad Ali with this message.

Apologising to my readers for this digression which is by the way, I come to the point again. Maulana Muhammad Ali complained about political leaders taking him to task for sending a wire to the Sultan of Kabul urging him not to make peace with the British Government. I, too, urged that it was not a wise step that he had taken. He kept quiet at the time but when we reached the Anand Bhavan (Pandit Nehru's palace), brother Muhammad Ali took me aside and taking out a paper from his hand-bag, gave a draft of a telegram to me to read. What was my astonishment when I saw the draft of the self-same telegram in the peculiar handwriting of the Father of the non-violent non-co-operation movement?

Mahatma Gandhi reached Anand Bhavan on the next morning. It was his day of Maunavrata. When I went to see him, he handed over to me a letter and a telegram which he had received from Pandit Malviyaji. The purport of the letter was that Lord Reading was a very good man in fact a saint and he appeared to be ready to give all the Reforms which the Indians wanted; so brother Gandhi should make

haste to go to Simla to have an interview with him (Lord Reading). The telegram simply urged the necessity of Gandhiji's going to Simla with a loving threat that Malviyaji would have to leave the cool breeze of Simla for the burning heat of Allahabad if he did not assent to go to Simla.

I told Gandhiji not to go without consulting the Working Committee of the Congress, which had been called for the next evening. The reasons which I then gave to dissuade Gandhiji from going to see Lord Reading need not be repeated here. They were repeated by Babu Ramananda Chatterji in the Modern Review.

Then came brother Andrews from Simla the same afternoon and after embracing me gave such a glowing account of his interview with the late Lord Chief Justice of Great Britian that all present were charmed. But I began a heartless cross-examination which elicited the fact that the astute diplomat had been reading the simple heart of the man of faith like an open book while keeping his own heart and mind completely closed to the eyes of his interviewer. Well, I gave my warning and my duty was discharged. Mahatmaji could not pay the least attention to my warning because he had full faith in his invincibility and as regards consulting the Working Committee he never thought of it. Mahatmaji went to Simla, he was made to sign a typed letter, addressed to the Private Secretary asking for an interview with the Viceroy and actually met Lord Reading. The upshot of that meeting is known all over the world. The astute diplomat took every advantage of the Saint's sincerity and simplicity and if Gandhiji's trial of truthfulness and the preservation of the sanctity of vow appeared with resplendent brightness, the actual mundane trophies of war remained in the hands of the man of the world.

—'The Liberator' 29-7-26



## GANDHI CONFIRMS THE MESSAGE

Mr. Gandhi addressed the Allahabad District Conference in the following manner held under the presidentship of Maulana Mohamed Ali :—

He could not understand why the Ali Brothers were going to be arrested as the rumour went, and why he was to remain free. They had done nothing, which he would not do. If they had sent a message to the Amir he also would send one, to inform the Amir that if he came no Indian as long as he, Mr. Gandhi, could help it, would help the Government to drive him back. If a man was true to his religion no Afghan or any power on earth could make him transgress his religious precepts. He knew he could not as yet control the actions of all Indians, but he knew many would not help the Government against the Amir as long as it would not grant "Swaraj" and redress the Punjab and Khilafat wrongs. He called upon the audience to do nothing against the dictates of Congress. They must report their grievances to the Khilafat and Congress Committees and act according to the instructions received.

—'Leader' 12-5-21



## OUR NEIGHBOURS

The following article from 'Young India' contains the clearest evidence of Gandhi's treason. In this article he orders the non-cooperators to pray for the defeat of the Government of India, in case of an Afghan invasion and declares that nothing can prevent them from overrunning India if they wished to.]

"Is not my article on the Afghan Bogey an invitation to the Afghans to invade the Indian border, and thus do I not become a direct party to violence?" Thus asks Mr. Andrews. "My article was written for Indians and for the Government. I do not believe the Afghans to be so foolish as to invade India on the strength of my article. But I see that it is capable of bearing the interpretation put upon it by Mr.



Andrews. I therefore hasten to inform all whom it may concern that not only do I not want to invite the Afghans or anybody else to come to our assistance, but am anxious for them not to come to our assistance. I am quite confident of India's ability to settle with the Government without extraneous help. Moreover I am interested in demonstrating the perfect possibility of attaining our end only by non-violent means." I would therefore strain every nerve to keep the Afghans out of the Indian border, but my anxiety to keep them off the Indian border will not go so far as to assist the Government with men or money.

In my article I have put my position as clearly as possible. For me the existing Government is the most intolerable of all, it is the greatest danger to the manhood of India and I would welcome its *re-formation* at any cost. It is my settled conviction that it is a Godless Government. That there are good Englishmen and good Indians connected with it makes it all the more dangerous for India. It keeps the nation's eyes off the inherent evil of it. My attack is not against individuals, it is directed against the system, against the aggregate called the Government. The best of Viceroys have been powerless to eradicate the poison of the system. The poison is its foundation. Therefore I can reconcile myself to all the worst that can happen to India in the place of the present system.

What however I would do is totally different from what I can do. I am sorry to have to confess that the movement has not yet acquired such hold on the soldier class as to embolden them to refuse assistance to the Government in time of need. When the soldier class has realised that they live for the nation, and that it is a travesty of a soldier's calling when he undertakes to kill on order, the battle of India's worldly freedom is won without more. As it is,

the Indian soldier is as much subject to fear as the layman. He fills the recruiting ranks because he believes that there is no other means of livelihood. The Government has made the profession of killing attractive by a system of special rewards, and by a system of skilfully devised punishments has made it well-nigh impossible for the soldier, once he is in, to get out without difficulty. In these circumstances I do not delude myself with the belief that the British Government will be without Indian help in the event of an immediate Afghani invasion. But it was my duty, especially when challenged, to put before the nation the position logically arising from Non-co-operation. It was necessary too, to warn the nation against being frightened by the Afghan bogey.

The second part of the question contains, in my opinion, a misconception of non-violence. It is no part of the duty of a non-violent non-co-operator to assist the Government against war made upon it by others. A non-violent non-co-operator may not secretly or openly encourage or assist any such war. He may not take part directly or indirectly in it. But it is no part of his duty to help the Government to end the war. On the contrary his prayer would be, as it must be, for the defeat of a power which he seeks to destroy. I, therefore, so far as my creed of non-violence is concerned, can contemplate an Afghan invasion with perfect equanimity, and equally so far as India's safety is concerned. The Afghans have no quarrel with India. They are a God-fearing people. I warn non-co-operators against judging the Afghans by the few savage specimens we see in Bombay or Calcutta. It is a superstition to suppose that they will overrun India if the British post at the frontier was withdrawn. Let us remember that there is nothing to prevent them from overrunning India today, if they wished to. But they are as fond of their country as we claim to be fond of:

ours. I must devote a separate article to an examination of the difficult problem that faces the residents near the frontier.

—'Young India' 18-5-21



## MORE CALUMNY

[ In this passage Gandhiji denies Swami Shraddhanand's allegations in a most unconvincing manner. The contrast between this answer and the previous article gives that Oscar Wilde had no reason to lament for "The Decay of Lying." ]

Q.—You did not hesitate to join the Ali Brothers in their intrigue to invite Amanullah Khan to invade India and set up Muslim Raj. You drafted a wire for Maulana Mahomed Ali advising the then Amir not to enter into a treaty with the British. The late Swami Shraddhanandji is reported to have seen the draft. And now you want the Hindus of Sind to make a present of their hearths and homes to their Mussalman oppressors instead of demanding the re-amalgamation of Sind with the Bombay Province, which alone can restore the reign of law to Sind. Why won't you realise that in this age of enlightenment and progress what the minorities expect is effective protection of their due rights, not mere pious counsels of perfection?

A.—*I have several such letters. Hitherto I have ignored them. But now I see that the news has gone through a revised and enlarged edition in the Hindu Mahasabha. An angry correspondent threatens that persons like him will begin to believe what has been stated so authoritatively. For the sake of my reputation, therefore, I must answer the question. But my correspondents should know that life for me would be a burden if I were to make it a point of controverting every false report about me or distortion of my writing. A reputation that requires such a mud-wall of protection is not worth keeping. So far as the charge*

of my intriguing with the Amir is concerned I can say that there is no truth whatsoever in it. Further, I know that the Brothers stoutly denied the charge when it was brought to their notice. And I believed them implicitly. I do not remember having drafted any telegram on behalf of Maulana Mahomed Ali to the then Amir. The alleged telegram is harmless in itself and does not warrant the deduction drawn from it. The late Swamiji never referred the matter to me for confirmation. It is wrong to say anything against dead men unless one has positive proof and stating it is relevant. The romance has been woven round my writings in 'Young India.' Deductions drawn from them are wholly unjustified. I would not be guilty of inviting any power to invade India for the purpose of expelling the English. For one thing, it would be contrary to my creed of non-violence. For another, I have too great a respect for English bravery and arms to think that an invasion of India can be successful without a strong combination of different powers. In any case, I have no desire to substitute British Rule with any other foreign rule. I want unadulterated Home Rule, however, inferior in quality it may be. My position remains today what it was when I wrote the 'Young India' paragraphs now sought to be used against me. Let me further remind the readers that I do not believe in secret methods.

As for Sind my advice stands. Reincorporation of Sind in the Bombay Province may or may not be a good proposition on other grounds, but certainly it is not for the purpose of greater protection of life and property. Every Indian, be he Hindu or any other, must learn the art of protecting himself. It is the condition of real democracy. The State has a duty. But no State can protect those who will not share with it the duty of protecting themselves.

On the way to Delhi.

—'Harijan' 4-2-40

## **Pre-war Conspiracies of the Indian Muslims.**

In this chapter we propose to relate the history of the pre-war Muslim conspiracies for the purpose of establishing Muslim Raj in India. The readers will not otherwise realise how deep rooted these conspiracies have been. It is a well-known fact that all the plots of Muslims find support in their Scriptures. According to an injunction of Islam, the Muslims must reside in that country alone which is Dar-ul-Islam or which is Dar-ul-Aman, meaning those countries where Islamic Raj has been established or those in which Islam can be practised without fear. Also it is expressly stated in their religious books that they must not reside in those countries where Islam does not rule or where there is no free scope to practise Islam. If the Islamic supremacy in a nation is destroyed or if certain restrictions are imposed on the practice of Islam then the Muslims must either leave that country or revolt against the new rule. No less an authority than A. K. Azad, the present Congress President has said, "Against the non-Muslim Government, Islam prescribes only sword, protracted battle and the cutting of throats." Their religion has classed the nations in three categories. Dar-ul-Islam which is the land of Islam, Dar-ul-Aman where Islam can be practised freely, and that nation where restrictions are imposed on Islam is Dar-ul-Harab or battlefield. According to the Muslim Scriptures, India is neither Dar-ul-Islam, nor Dar-ul-Aman. In a meeting of the Central Legislature on 26-8-38, Kaji Mahomed Ahamad Kajimi a follower of the late Mahomad Ali, frankly says, "After the abolition of the posts of Quazis in 1864, we find that the real

agitation started in India. It was at that time that continuous agitation was carried on by the Mussalmans and they decided that India was not Dar-ul-Islam, it ceased to be Dar-ul-Aman and it was Dar-ul-Harab. Even up till today certain of our prayers are offered on the basis that it is Dar-ul-Harab."

Criticising these utterances of Kajimi, Suresh-Chandra Deo remarks in the I. A. R., "Here we think we get an inside view of the mind of the Muslims in India, who under the influence of old-world ideas are being taught everyday of their life in their mosques that India is a country of enmity. We have been told of a sect among the Muslims of Bengal about 30 lakhs strong to whom congregational prayers are prohibited, owing to an injunction of Quran. Because in enemy countries, the life of the faithful assembled in a congregation for prayer was likely to be exposed to attacks leading to mass massacre. This daily repetition of India being an enemy country, the offering of daily prayers based on the thought or belief that India was Dar-ul-Harab, this practice creates and starts those mental processes that make the Muslims in India so impatient, that make possible that outburst of violence of thought and action at the slightest of occasions."

Now, do we really understand how these riots fomented by Muslims originate in mosques. When once Muslims have decided that India is Dar-ul-Harab, a battle field, then they are either to conquer it or run away from the battle field. Of these two paths, that of leaving India, or Hijrat has been proved unsuccessful according to the results of 1921. Hence those faithful Muslims have but only one way and that is 'Jihad.' In fact the Muslims have declared Jihad on India from 1824. For the Rowlatt Committee members, while describing the genesis of Islamic conspiracies say, "Saiyad Ahmad, who had begun life as a soldier of fortune, adopted Wahabri docti-

nes, visited Mecca in 1822, returned to India, where he acquired a following at various places in the Gangetic plane, and in 1824 appeared among the mountain tribes on the Peshawar border, preaching Jihad or war against the Sikh Kingdom of the Punjab. Together with his adherents, he founded a Colony which, although small, has survived many vicissitudes and remains until now. It has frequently been assisted by recruits and funds from Co-religionists in this country.... Its members regard India as a land not governed by Muslims and therefore unfit for Muslim habitation, a land of the enemy (Dar-ul-Harab). They have always preached Jihad. They have always kept in touch with and drawn support from a secret organisation of friends in India. During the troubles of 1857, they were joined by a number of mutineers and endeavoured unsuccessfully to bring about a general frontier attack. Later on, they took part in various border wars and in 1915 were concerned in the rising, which led up to the engagements at Rustam and Shabkadr." They further state, "The flight of the fifteen students from Lahore in February 1915, was a visible sign that there are in this country, as there were fifty years ago, a few Mahomedans who teach that the way of salvation lies in waging war against the infidel Government of India either personally or by recruiting for or sending money to the Mujahidin. This fact has been established by other evidence. In January 1917, it was discovered that a party of eight Mahomedans had joined the Mujahidins from the districts of Rangpur and Dacca in Eastern Bengal. In March 1917, two Bengali Mahomedans were arrested in the North-West Frontier Province with Rs. 8000, in their possession, which they were conveying to the fanatical colony."

It has now been established from Rowlatt Report that ~~there is~~ a fanatical colony of Muslims on the Frontier who

propagate in favour of 'Jihad' and that there is a secret organisation in India which aids this colony, in men and money. Now it is proper to state as to who were the people that supported this fanatical colony in men. This information can be had from 'India as I knew it' of Sir Michel Odwayer the then Governor of Punjab. We now quote this information as stated in our 'Ladhau Rajkaran.' "In 1914, a Muslim Educational Conference was held at Rawalpindi. Among others extremist Muslims like Mahomed Ali and Mr. Abul Kalam Azad attended this conference. When this conference was over some of them went to Peshawar and some to Lahore. There these leaders addressed private meetings of students, or injected them with their views at tea parties. After the departure of these leaders Sir Michel Odwayer came to know much about their activities. In February 1915, 15 students from Lahore and many others from Pesahwar and Kohat ran away from their homes as is obvious from Rowlatt Report. These fugitives had first been to the colony of fanatics." Having stained their hands in this affair the above mentioned Maulanas were arrested in 1915 under D. I. A. The readers can well realise as to the part played by our present, Rashtrapati in anti-national conspiracies. Further light is shed on the above affair by a statement of A. K. Azad quoted from the Leader' of 3-6-21.

"Regarding the Afghan Bogey the Maulana thinks that the man who saw Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya at Benaras was not from Kabul but from India itself and was sent by Moulvi Niamutullah, the chief of the old Indian Mujahidins of Bunair, in the N. W. Frontier. The Maulana says that in March 1920 this man saw him too in Bombay when he (the Maulana) was there for the Congress and Khilafat conferences just after his release from internment."

Even before the outbreak of war the Muslim leaders



were engaged in conspiring with Turkey. In 1912 Indian Muslims had raised a fund to aid the Turks. In order to hand over the sum Maulana Jaffarali of Lahore had been to Istambul personally. A carpet from Khalifa was presented to the Badashahi Mosque of Lahore through his consul general Khalil Khalid Bey, who had been to India in the early months of 1914. In 1912 Dr. Ansari had been to Istambul to serve the injured Turk soldiers. In return two doctors from Turkey came to India and we can clearly guess their activities from Rowlatt Report "Through influences of this kind, the outbreak of the war found a small section of Punjab Muslims out of humour with the British Government."

One can now realise how close must have been the contact of Azad (once a Turk citizen) with the Turkish emissaries.

This being the history of pre-war Muslim conspiracies, it is no wonder that Khilafat leaders demanded help from Amir Amanulla, in 1920-21.

## WARTIME TREACHERY

Bhai Paramanand in his introduction to the History of Hindu Mahasabha observes, "The alliance between Mahatma Gandhi and the Ali Brothers, forms in my opinion one of the most unfortunate episodes, in the recent history of Hindusthan." The alliance is not only woeful but also very instructive. It deserves a careful study.

Before we analyse the friendship between Gandhiji and his dear Brothers, let us first study Gandhiji's psychology. Gandhiji is a theist, a devout Vaishnav, worshipping God as a beloved worships her Lover. This peculiar trait in his mentality is well illustrated in a book edited by Sir Radhakrishnan. This trait and the psychology behind it are met at every step in his career and politics. A specific instance of this tendency is quoted by Mr. Indulal Yagnik in his work 'Gandhiji as I know him.' Gandhiji was standing as a witness before the Hunter Committee.

"To a question by Sir Chimanlal if a high degree of saintliness and spiritual culture was not required to enable one to suffer without rancour and resentment, Mr. Gandhi promptly replied, "Sir Chimanlal, every woman suffers yet every woman is not a saint." This episode throws a flood of light on Gandhiji's mental make-up. He also displays his sophistic bias in his reply. Unlike other Vaishnavas he is a 'sophist' out and out.

Women are always ambitious to convert and ennoble men of sinful life by their magnetic influence. In his school

days Gandhiji tried a similar experiment on a vicious student. They became fast friends. In his autobiography Gandhiji makes a reference to this event. He told his mother and brother "I know he has the weaknesses you attribute to him, but you do not know his virtues. He cannot lead me astray as my association with him is meant to reform him." This manifests another besetting sin of Gandhiji, *viz.* his pompous vanity. As a result of that friendship, contracted in defiance of the advice given by his elders, Gandhiji was on the point succumbing to the evil influences. He was saved from the mishap by his good luck. Gandhiji's friendship with the Muslims belongs to the same category. He says in his autobiography:—

"I was seeking the friendship of good Mussalmans and was eager to understand the Mussalman mind through contact with their purest and most patriotic representatives. I therefore never needed any pressure to go with them *wherever they took me* in order to get into intimate touch with them."

In those days he did not realise the fact that he was seeking a mirage. There was hardly any Mussalman who was religious and at the same time patriotic—a lover of India. After twenty years' experience he may have made the painful discovery, but his vanity is so strong that he would never acknowledge the truth.

Gandhiji remarks further on, "Next I opened correspondence with the Government for the release of the Brothers. In that connection I studied the Brothers' views and activities about the Khilafat. I had discussions with Mussalman friends. I felt that if I would become a true friend of the Muslims, I must render all possible help in securing the release of the Brothers and a just settlement of the Khilafat question."

We have to remember that Ali Brothers were strong

protagonists of pan-Islamic movement. Gandhiji became their friend with a view to understand the Muslim mind. He wanted to convert them into patriotic Indians. In his attempt to fuse Islam with Indian Nationalism Gandhiji himself became its mortal enemy. He lost his nationalism.

Let us survey the situation in India, when Gandhiji took the fatal decision of striving, for the release of Ali Brothers and the resurrection of the Khilafat.

In the year 1917, when the Government had decided to release Mrs. Besant, they were willing to let off Ali Brothers too on certain conditions. One Mr. Abdul Majid, a high officer in C. I. D. was deputed to Chhindwada where the Brothers were interned. He interviewed the Brothers and communicated the official formula for their release. It ran thus:—

“ I shall abstain during the remainder of the war from doing, writing or saying anything intended or reasonably likely to encourage or assist the enemies of the King Emperor. ( Turkey, the head of the Islamic countries and the centre of pan-Islamic movement was at war with England then ). I shall also abstain from doing, writing or saying any thing, intended or reasonably likely to be construed as an attack upon the allies and friends of the King Emperor.

“ I also promise to abstain from violent or unconstitutional agitation which is likely to affect the public safety. The abstentions promised above are not intended to cause me to refrain from participation in politics within constitutional limits.”

The second condition is important inasmuch as it suggests the intrigues in which Ali Brothers were actively engaged when they were free.

Ali Brothers added their rider to the above formula.

“ We understand and base the above undertaking on

the clear understanding that the abstentions promised above, are not intended to restrict in the slightest measure our freedom to observe all our religious duties as Mussalmans."

Government did not accept the rider as it nullified the formula and left the Brothers free to follow the dictates of their Khalifa and the Fatwas of Mullas and Moulavis. The Brothers were not released.

In order to grasp the implications contained in the rider which on its face appears quite innocuous we quote an incident from the History of Afghanistan by Sir George Mac-Mun. During the Great War of 1914, the Turkish Ambassador went to Kabul to solicit the help of the Amir. The Amir replied—

"But a good Muslim am I and what the Khalifa (the Emperor of Turkey) wills is mine to do. I await the Turkish armies on their way to India and I shall be ready to lead the hosts of Islam by their side."

To a good Muslim the command of the Khalifa, who is the supreme religious authority of Islam, is sacrosanct and inviolable. The Amir Habibullah was a pious Muslim. So were Ali Brothers. Whenever there is a conflict between the two loyalties, the loyalty to one's own country and the loyalty to the Khalifa, a good Muslim has to turn a traitor to the country and obey the spiritual authority. Ali Brothers were imprisoned by Government when engaged in fulfilling devoutly their duty as pious Muslims. Nationalism in India is incompatible with the idea of Islam.

Mr. Ghate, the pleader of Ali Brothers in his open letter to Mrs. Besant observes:—

"There are two letters which were clearly stated to have persuaded the Government of India at the last moment, not to restore their alleged authors to liberty. One of these is stated to be a letter written to His Majesty the Amir of Afghanistan by Mr. Mahomed Ali in Persian—a language in which I understand he cannot and has never attempted to compose. In this he is alleged to have asked the Amir to

invade India. It is stated that this letter was actually received by his Majesty and then sent to Government through a special messenger."

The Brothers declared the letter to be a forgery. The partisans of Ali Brothers including Gandhiji persist in saying that it must be a forged letter for the simple reason that Ali Brothers declare it to be one. Can credulity go further?

We beg to quote an extract from the Historic State Trial of Ali Brothers and Five Others. Ali Brothers were arrested for treason and tried at Karachi. During the course of the trial we read ( vide page 255 ).

" Here Mr. Mahomed Ali quoted a letter which he had sent to the Viceroy when he was in jail, concerning the Afghan war, pointing out that Muslims could not help the Government against the Afghans but on the contrary were bound by their religion to sympathise with the latter, unless it was clearly shown that the Afghan War was not the outcome of the treatment meted out by the British Government to the Khilafat, but was an act of aggression pure and simple on the part of the Afghans.

"He said that the Viceroy never hanged him for that but on the contrary let him off and even arranged for his passage to England to educate the British public on the matter of the Khilafat. "

A man who is capable of writing in this vein to the Viceroy may protest vociferously that his letter requesting the Amir of Afghanistan to invade India is a downright forgery. Would any sane person ever believe in his protests?

In a speech delivered at Karachi, Mahomed Ali had discussed the ethics of his promises. He maintained that there are occasions when our opponents have no right to complain that we are untrue to our pledged word. He

explained to what extent he was going to carry out the promises given to Lord Reading. Says he "Today no Englishman has any right to enquire from us whether or not we shall stick to our promise until and unless those promises are fulfilled which are given to the whole world by Loyd George and which all have been falsified; until and unless those promises are fulfilled which were made by Lord Hardinge during the War."

The inference to be drawn is clear. So long as the British Government do not fulfil their promises to the Muslims, the latter are not expected to be very scrupulous about their pledges. The Maulana was perfectly right in taking up this attitude. Nobody can blame him for adopting this stand in matters of politics. The point is, can Gandhiji associate himself intimately with men who profess such ideas of relative morality? Are they not destructive of absolute truth which he preaches to the world? How can he embrace them as his brothers?

We may grant that Mahomed Ali could not write a letter in Persian, but that does not prove that the letter he sent to the Amir of Afghanistan was not his letter. The mother of Mahomed Ali did not know English but she did not repudiate the English letters written by Mr. Ghate, the pleader, at her instance.

We can adduce a circumstantial evidence regarding the genuineness of the letter. If it was not Mahomed Ali's, who forged it? Certainly it cannot be the Government of India. They had nothing to gain by this forgery. On the other hand if people learnt that such a letter was in the possession of the Government, the Amir, who was friendly to them, ran the risk of losing his life. We must peep a little into the History of Afghanistan to understand this intricate problem. In October 1915 a Turko-German deputation arrived at Kabul. It egged on the Afghan Government,

to invade India. At this time the Afghans, who are noted for their religious zeal, were heart and soul with the Turkish people. Amir Habibullah found himself between two fires. He was a friend of the Government of India who paid him a handsome subsidy. The Turks were his co-religionists and they were in danger. The Amir was forced to sign a treaty against his wishes with the Germans and the Turks. Afterwards the Amir took a memorable step, Sardar Iqbal Ali Shah, the Afghan Historian refers to it as follows :—

“Meantime Amanullah’s father, one dark night called the Moslem representative of Britain at Kabul and exhorted him to communicate his message in utmost secrecy, more or less in the following terms. “Tell your Government that I am their loyal friend. They ought to believe in me; and if in any of my actions or utterances they see anything contrary to this idea, tell them that that is being done on purpose. My position is very delicate.”

It is surmised that with a view to convince the Government of India of his absolute sincerity and fidelity, he handed over to the representative, the confidential letters that he had received from the Indian Muslim conspirators at the same time. When the Afghan subjects of Habibullah got an inkling of this secret interview they were enraged. Iqbal Ali Shah says “Habibullah thenceforward was a marked man, one in whom the nation had no confidence.”

The Afghans were already highly displeased with the Amir because he had refused to invade India in accordance with the wishes of the Khalifa. If over and above this they had known that he supplied the British Government, who were at war with the Khalifa, the secret documents of the pan-Islamist conspirators, there was every likelihood of an immediate revolution in Afghanistan. The Government of India kept mum over the letter of Mahomed Ali in order to save their friend, the Amir. But when Mr. Montagu assumed the office of the Secretary of State for India, the friends of



Ali Brothers pressed the Government of India for their release. The Rajah of Mahamudabad, a friend of Mahomed Ali was informed by the Government in confidence of some of the intrigues of Mahomed Ali; Mahomed Ali got the news of Habibullah's secret through the Rajah, his friend. Mr. Ghate, the pleader of Mahomed Ali wrote an open letter to Mrs. Besant stating therein the charges preferred by the Government against his client. Mr. Ghate attempted to rebut these charges towards the close of 1917. Dr. Ansari issued a pamphlet in defence of Mahomed Ali in the year 1918. It contained Mr. Ghate's letter. The pamphlet had an all India circulation. Since the publication of the pamphlet there were attempts to assassinate Habibullah. By the end of 1918 on the occasion of his birthday, the Amir was fired at. The bullet missed its target. The attempt proved abortive; but the criminal could not be traced by the Afghan Police. At last the Amir was murdered at midnight in February 1919. When we reflect on this sequence of events, we come to the conclusion that the Government were quite justified in their discretion. The moment they revealed the secret of the Amir to the Rajah of Mahamudabad, their friend's life was jeopardised.

Sir Shankaran Nair, an ex-President of the Congress and a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council was also convinced that a conspiracy was being hatched by Mahomed Ali in conjunction with the Afghan Government. We can prove it from the interview which Mrs. Besant had with the Viceroy in connection with the release of Ali Brothers. Referring to this interview Mrs. Besant remarks,

"H. E. the Viceroy was willing to listen to every argument I could urge, and encourage the most complete frankness of speech, but he refused to regard my own case as on all fours with (she had been interned by the Govt. and later on released.) that of Mahomed Ali. The one was

the case connected with the War ( the case of Mahomed Ali ) the other was connected with civil reforms. The Viceroy and his Council had considered and reconsidered the matter, and I was told by one who is in the confidence of the Govt. that they were unanimous in the decision as to their duty."

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru who succeeded Sir Shankaran Nair as a councillor on the Viceroy's Executive Council adopted the same attitude.

Unprejudiced people will perceive the truth, they will realise the kind of patriotism entertained by Ali Brothers.. In order to convince incorrigible Gandhiite Hindus, we shall quote an excerpt from 'Young India' ( a paper edited by Gandhiji ). It would give them a clue as to the sincere opinion held by Gandhiji about Ali Brothers.

In 1924 Gandhiji undertook a fast of 21 days at Delhi. He had a talk with Shaukat Ali on the eve of the fast. Rev. Andrews published it in 'Young India.' During the course of the conversation Gandhiji says to Shaukat Ali, " My dear Shaukat, I cannot bear the people accusing you and your brother of having broken your promises to me. I cannot bear the thought of such an accusation. I Must die for it."

We are already familiar with the ethics of promises propounded by Mahomed Ali. If they could cheat with a clean conscience the Viceroy they could also cheat their friend Gandhiji if it was likely to help the sacred cause of the Khilafat and Islam. After all Gandhiji was an infidel and the friendship was purely political. Gandhiji's desperate utterance proves that his dear Brothers had committed some act of perfidy towards him. Whatever love he might profess about them in public, we know what his inner thoughts were. He set about their spiritual conversion but came to grief. He resorted to vicarious punishment in Christian style. It reveals the womanish element in Gandhiji's character.

## **TILAK versus GANDHI**

We shall now put under searchlight this inordinate thirst felt by Gandhiji for the friendship of Ali Brothers. Mr. Indulal Yagnik, an old co-worker of Gandhiji throws a flood of light on this mysterious friendship in his book "GANDHIJI as I know him." Says Mr. Yagnik "Mr. Tilak's orthodox Hinduism had unfortunately prevented him from securing the confidence or affection of the Mahommedans of India. But Gandhiji's reformed Hinduism had enabled him to secure the hearty friendship of all the leading Mahommedans in South Africa. So, he had set his heart from the very beginning on creating genuine friendship between the Hindus and the Mahommedans. And as future events will show he very soon succeeded in stealing a march on the orthodox Mr. Tilak by placing himself at the head of a real nationalist movement, broad-based on the full co-operation of the two largest communities of the country."

This passage gives us an important clue. Gandhiji led Hindus and Muslims in South Africa. He was anxious to be their supreme leader in India. Unfortunately he did not take into consideration the different situations of the two countries. Mr. Tilak was a formidable adversary. He represented the Hindu mind and ideals. Gandhiji was naturally very jealous of him. He was out to destroy the influence of Mr. Tilak and his party. With this end in view he allied himself with those parties who would help him to oust Mr. Tilak. To win national leadership he went to the length of courting the friendship of anti-national

Muslims like Ali Brothers and got involved in their nefarious intrigues. He thought it his duty to drive out Mr. Tilak from leadership at all costs. After Amritsar Congress he writes in 'Young India'—

“For as party formation progresses, we suppose it would be considered quite the proper thing for party leaders to use others as tools so long as there are any to be used. Care will have therefore to be taken rather to purify our politics than for fear of being used as tools to hesitate to take the right-course. L. Tilak represents a definite school of thought of which he makes no secret. He considers that everything is fair in politics. We have joined issue with him in that conception of political life. We consider that political life of the country will become thoroughly corrupt if we import western tactics and methods.”

Gandhiji reveals his hatred for Mr. Tilak unreservedly in the above passage. He was willing to stoop to the lowest depth if he could thereby succeed in driving out Tilak's party from the arena of Indian politics. It was tantamount to exorcising the devil by invoking a super-devil. The tragedy is that the super-devil refuses to leave Gandhiji in peace. The reader can judge for himself if this was any improvement upon the conventional methods used by Mr. Tilak. The fact is Gandhiji is adept in clothing his designs in the loftiest moral principles. Hon. Mr. Khaparde alone was quickwitted enough to grasp this policy of Gandhiji after Amritsar Congress. In the introduction to the III Vol. of Tilak's reminiscences, he openly remarks :—

“It was Gandhiji's secret resolve to smash the powerful and formidable machine constructed by Mr. Tilak with indefatigable zeal and exertion. It seems as if Gandhiji had taken a vow to undermine and destroy the political strongholds built up by Mr. Tilak.”

The documentary evidence confirming Hon. Mr. Khaparde's conclusions has been cited by us from Gandhiji's own

writings. It had escaped Hon. Mr. Khaparde's notice. Let us hope that the readers will now get an accurate idea of Gandhiji's politics. The wily chelas of Gandhiji may perfidiously proclaim that their Guru had no hatred but all love for Mr. Tilak. The unmistakable verdict of History is clear for those who care to read it.

Mr. Tilak replied to the above article of Gandhiji in 'Young India,' dated 28-1-1920 as follows:—

"I am sorry to see that in your article on 'Reform Resolution' in the last issue you have represented me as holding that I considered everything fair in politics. I write this to you to say that my view is not correctly represented herein. Politics is a game of worldly people and not of sadhus and instead of the maxim अक्रोधेन जयेत्क्रोधम् (one should conquer anger by opposing it with tranquillity, non-anger) as preached by Buddha, I prefer to rely on the maxim of Shri Krishna ये यथा मां प्रपद्यन्ते तांस्तथैव भजाम्यहम् (my response to the devotees is in perfect harmony with the manner of their approach.) Both methods are equally honest and righteous, but the one is more suited to this world than the other. Any further explanation about the difference will be found in my "Gita-Rahasya."

Gandhiji comments on this reply as follows:—

"With deference to the Lokamanya I venture to say that it betrays mental laziness to think that the world is not for sadhus. The epitome of all religion is to promote Purushartha, and Purushartha is nothing but a desperate attempt to become a Sadhu, i. e. to become a gentleman in every sense of the term. Finally, when I wrote the sentence about everything being fair in politics according to Lokamanya's creed I had in mind his oft-repeated quotation शठं प्रति शाठ्यम् (Tit for Tat). To me it enunciates bad law. I shall not despair of the Lokamanya with all his acumen agreeably surprising India one day with a philosophical dissertation proving the falsity of the doctrine."

Gandhiji's rejoinder betrays his colossal ignorance and poor logic. It is an example of a fight between a giant and a pigmy. Gandhiji makes himself ridiculous when he attempts to face Mr. Tilak's argument. Mr. Tilak wrote

'politics is a game of the worldly people and not of Sadhus.' Gandhiji perverts this pithy remark, putting a wrong interpretation on it, viz., 'Sadhus have no place in this world.' Mr. Tilak hinted that Sadhus ought not to pollute themselves by contact with the worldly game of politics. He never meant that they had no place in this world. Gandhiji's premises are false and the conclusion he draws from them viz. 'Mental laziness of Tilak' is not only absurd but highly unjust and offensive also. He praises Mr. Tilak's 'acumen.' Is it compatible with mental laziness? Is it not a downright contradiction? This charge of mental laziness proves the utter wickedness of Gandhiji's attack. He remarks further 'Purushartha is the epitome of all religion, and Purushartha is nothing but a desperate attempt to become a sadhu.' Gandhiji does not know the significance of the word 'Purushartha', yet he has the audacity to explain it to his adversary in a serious controversy. His ignorance is extremely irritating to the worldly people who have no idea of becoming sadhus.

Purushartha is four-fold. It covers religious duties, acquisition of wealth, fulfilment of desires and salvation. Sadhus concentrate all their efforts on attaining the highest of all Purusharthas. Worldly men try to fulfil the first three categories according to their ability. Purushartha therefore is not a desperate attempt to become a sadhu. If any person makes a desperate attempt to become a sadhu, without first qualifying himself properly he goes to hell. A sadhu is not a perfect gentleman as Gandhiji interprets the word. A gentleman pursues अर्थ and काम, a sadhu cannot. Politics covers these two Purusharthas. Again शठं प्रति शठं does not mean that everything is fair in politics. The maxim implies that on certain occasions, we have to counteract the evil

designs of our opponents by cunning in self-defence. Bharavi illustrates this principle in his famous verse—

व्रजन्ति ते मूढधियः पराभवम्  
भवन्ति मायाविषु ये न मायिनः  
प्रविश्य हि घ्नन्ति शठास्तथाविधान्  
असंवृतांगान्निशिता इवेषवः

(The silly, who forbear from using wily methods to checkmate the cunning enemies, are doomed. The crooked assail their simple enemies at their weakest point and destroy them even as sharp arrows penetrate the unprotected part of the body.)

The tragedy is that Gandhiji has absolutely no knowledge of the political traditions of India. If he had studied these traditions he would never have experimented with his pet doctrines of truth and non-violence.

The doctrine of resistance propounded by Mr. Tilak is an index to his freedom-loving mental outlook. The doctrine of non-resistance preached by Gandhiji betrays his slave mentality. It displays a defeatist tendency. His servility to the English during the early part of his life and to the Muslims in the latter part of his life is a result of the same mentality. His love for Muslims transcends his love for Englishmen. He hates British domination but is ready to accept in its place the rule of Islam. His ideas of Hinduism are so monstrous, so perverse that he would gladly see Hindu India lying prostrate at the feet of Muslim rulers. These are harsh words. We proceed to substantiate them. When Gandhiji presided over the Cow-Protection Conference at Belgaum in 1924 he made the following remarks:—

“ I would go so far as to say that just as, so long as Hindu-Muslim unity is not effected, Hinduism not purged of the taint of untouchability and the wearing of hand-spun and

hand-woven khadder does not become universal, Swaraj would be impossible of attainment, even so the term Swaraj would be devoid of all meaning so long as we have not found a way of saving the cow, for that is the touch-stone on which Hinduism must be tested and proved before there can be any real Swaraj in India."

Now it is advisable to support the cow-protection movement in so far as it tends to increase the national prosperity. But to maintain that Swaraj has no meaning without cow-protection is a highly pernicious proposition. We point out the danger lurking behind this vicious idea. Gandhiji says further on "I have been telling Shaukat Ali all along that I was helping him to save his cow i.e. Khilafat, because I hoped to save my cow thereby. I am prepared to place my life in the hands of Mussalmans, to live merely on their sufference. Why? Simply because I might be able to protect the cow."

In this passage Gandhiji talks of entrusting his life to the care of Muslims. He is speaking in his public capacity as a representative of Hinduism. Whether and how far beef-eating Muslims are to be pampered for the protection of the cow is a moot-point. We leave it to the discretion of cow-protectionists. What we want to emphasise is the fact that Gandhiji was making such a humiliating and unfortunate offer to the Muslims on behalf of the Hindus. He would chain Hindus hand and foot and ask the Muslims to treat them as slaves if they liked, in exchange for the uncertain advantage of saving the cow. Gandhiji did his best to save the Muslim Cow (The Khilafat). Did Shaukat Ali fulfil his part of the bargain? We are constrained to say that men like Gandhiji who are prepared to sell their birth-right for a trifle are traitors to their country's cause.



People might argue that Gandhiji's utterances at the Cow-Protection Conference were not meant to be taken literally. We beg to point out that he was quite serious. He gave vent to a similar idea at the first Khilafat Conference held at Delhi on 23-11-1919. He said " Unconditional co-operation in the Khilafat movement means the protection of the cow. "

Astute Muslim politicians offered the bait of cow-protection and captured Gandhiji; the latter swallowed the bait and became a staunch defender of the Khilafat. In the above Conference Maulana Abdul Bari declared :—

" The Mussalman's khandani would be at stake if they forgot the co-operation of the Hindus. I for my part will say that we should stop cow-killing irrespective of their co-operation because we are the children of the same soil."

Noble sentiments these ! Muslim leaders used them profusely to beguile Gandhiji and other Hindu leaders. They gave the empty words and won the solid support of the Congress for the Khilafat by hypnotising Gandhiji. Cow-protection vanished into the limbo of oblivion. Congress Ministries under the supervision of Gandhiji did nothing to further the cause of cow-protection, although he had declared that Swaraj without cow-protection was meaningless to him.

## ORIGIN OF KHILAFAT MOVEMENT

We discussed in the last chapter, the motives that led Gandhiji to identify himself with the Khilafat movement. Let us now discuss the advisability or otherwise, from the national standpoint for Hindus to take part in the Khilafat movement. The Khilafat movement is an off-shoot of the pan-Islamic doctrine. The founder of pan-Islamism Maulana Jamal-ud-din visited India in the early eighties. On that occasion he injected the Indian Muslim leaders with his dangerous doctrine. Babu Bipinchandra Pal in his essay on pan-Islamism has summarised succinctly the results of that initiation. "Jamal-ud-din passed through India early in the eighties, and the attitude of aloofness of the educated Mahomedans of India from the political activities of their Hindu fellow-countrymen was, I think, openly and avowedly taken up gradually, immediately after his visit. I still remember the memorable utterance of Sir Syed Ahamad at a reception held in his honour, when the Syed was on a visit to Calcutta in 1876 or 1877, in which he compared the Hindus and the Mahomedans of Hindustan, to the two eyes and two hands of a man. It is notorious how rapidly this spirit and attitude was changed and the revered Syed openly set himself up as an antagonist to the Indian nationalist movement, then represented by the Indian National Congress."

Jamal-ud-din made a powerful impression upon the minds of Indian Muslims. The immediate result of Jamal-ud-din's influence was visible in the strong opposition offered by the

educated Muslims to the Congress. The communal electorate was another consequence of the same influence. Syed Amir Ali was an associate of H. H. the Agakhan in the agitation for demanding separate electorates. It is well-known how Syed Amir Ali was hypnotised by the contact of Jamal-ud-din (See the account given by Blunt in his book 'India under Ripon'). But the fact, that Syed Amir Ali threatened the then Secretary of State, Lord Morley, with the wrath of Turkey, and wrested from him the consent to the communal electorate, is not so well-known. While replying to the deputation of H. H. the Agakhan and Amir Ali, Lord Morley observed, "I know very well that any injustice, any suspicion, that we are capable of being unjust, to Mahomedans in India would certainly provoke a severe and injurious reaction in Constantinople." (Vide Lord Morley's Indian Speeches, p. 101).

Lt. Col. U. N. Banarji draws the attention of the Indian public to this remark of Lord Morley in his work "Are the Bengali Hindus a Dying Race", and comments thereon, "I wonder how many Hindus understand the significance of this utterance. We Hindus are most ridiculously, the most contemptibly ignorant. We have no idea about what is going on around us." The Hindus, as if to prove the truth of this rebuke administered by Lt. Col. Banarji, did learn nothing whatsoever from the remark of Lord Morley; they completely ignored their vital interests and took an active share in the Khilafat movement with a view to aid the Turks.

In order to give an accurate idea of how fatal it is, from the national point of view, to aid the Turks we quote an extract from the work of Dr. H. C. E. Zacharias a disciple of Hon. Mr. Gokhale. "Turkey had been the palladium of every Indian Muslim, the Sultan of Turkey being the Khalifa of all the faithful, his sword their ultimate protection against all

enchroachments on the part of the infidel ; what would happen to them if that sure shield of theirs were removed ? Without help from outside, a minority in India itself ; what future was awaiting them" (Renascent India.) These sentiments entertained by Muslims were cent per cent anti-national. The Khilafat movement which was started to satisfy their antinational sentiments was sure to result in a degeneration of the idea of nationalism. Indian nation as a whole stood to gain nothing from the Khilafat movement ; on the contrary it was suicidal to encourage such a move.

All of us are now aware of how that movement encouraged and intensified the fanaticism of Muslims. India is now suffering from its evil consequences in the form of Pakistan movement. Ever since the Hindus co-operated with the Muslims on the question of Khilafat many a Hindu leader has fallen victim to the wrong notion that unless he secures the co-operation of Muslim leaders in each and every political movement, it will be far from being a national movement. And if he were to take part in such a movement it would be a slur on his national spirit. The fact is patent that it is not in the interest of Muslims, who cherish the ambition of dominating over the whole of India, to allow the spirit of nationalism to grow powerful and hence they are ever reluctant to support any genuine national movement. If a few Muslims are found to be participating in the Congress activities, it is solely with a view to killing the national principles. No lover of the country can afford to shut his eyes to this fact. The possibility of conquering the whole of India a second time, with the aid of foreign Muslims, is discussed in a work called 'Confederacy of India' published by Sir Muhammed Shahnawzkhan.

"The next point which the Muslims should always bear in mind when tying their hopes to the neighbouring Muslim

countries, is the difference which has come over Hindu India, since the fall of Mogul Empire on account of Western influences. The new India is not and will not be the India of the later Hindu period, divided against itself and torn by internecine dissensions, petty quarrels and jealousies of its Chiefs and Rajas. Now it will not be possible for any new Muslim invader to reconquer it by reducing one raja after the other. The whole of the non-Muslim India which follows Hindu culture will stand up against the Muslim aggressor as one solid block. The sentiment of nationalism which was notoriously missing among the Hindus of yore has immensely developed among the Hindus of today. It has almost welded their higher castes into a single nation. Any ally of the Muslims of India will have to face the Hindu India of the Hindu masses and not the Hind of the Rajas. "

The passage evaluates the spirit of solidarity among the Hindus rather too highly. If really the Hindus had displayed constant vigilance about the machinations of Indian and foreign Muslims, had they been imbued with a firm determination to resist the intrigues of Muslims even at the cost of their lives and homes should a contingency arise, there would not have been an occasion for us to expatiate upon this topic. Since the day Gandhiji made common cause with the Ali Brothers and added the fifth wheel of Khilafat to the chariot of the Congress, Gandhite Hindus have taken it into their head that bringing into light the intrigues of Muslims is tantamount to swerving from high national ideals. Gandhiji's philosophy of non-resistance is selfdestructive. Its propagation among the Hindu nationalists has not only reduced their power of opposing the enemy to a nought but also made them mentally feeble in that their will is atrophied. Realising how Gandhiji achieved a tremendous success in his goal of winning the status of

a dictator for the whole of India, by his policy of surrendering to the Muslims, a keen competition is afoot among pseudo-nationalist leaders for acquiring the position of Gandhiji, by yielding more and more to the whims of Muslims. The crafty Muslim politicians reap a rich harvest from this perverse psychological attitude of nationalist leaders. These leaders are anxious to a fault about the absence of a few Maulanas or Khans in the Congress. They are nervous that it might destroy the nationalist appearance of the Congress organisation. As a result, Muslims, who have devoted their whole life to the work of carrying on underhand intrigues with their foreign brothers have captured the reins of the Congress. If one contemplates upon this lamentable state of affairs, one will comprehend a bit how the nation is pursuing a wrong track being blinded by the Khilafat movement.

Gandhiji was fully cognisant of the motives that led the Indian Muslims to start the Khilafat movement as early as 1920. While narrating the account of the meeting of the Khilafat Committee at Allahabad, he writes in 'Young India' of 9-6-1920, "Mrs. Besant and Dr. Sapru strongly dissuaded the Mahomedans present from the policy of non-co-operation. The other Hindu speakers made non-committal speeches. Whilst the other Hindu speakers approved of the principle of non-co-operation in theory, they saw many practical difficulties and they feared also complications arising from Mahomedans, welcoming an Afghan invasion of India. The Mahomedan speakers gave the fullest and frankest assurances that they would fight to a man any invader who wanted to conquer India, but they were equally frank in asserting that any invasion from without undertaken with a view to uphold the prestige of Islam and to vindicate justice would have their full sympathy if not their actual support. It is easy enough to understand and justify the

Hindu caution. It is difficult to resist the Mahomedan position. In my opinion the best way to prevent India from becoming the battle-ground between the forces of Islam and those of the English, is for Hindus to make non-co-operation a success and I have little doubt that if the Mahomedans remain true to their declared intention and are able to exercise selfrestraint and make sacrifices, the Hindus will play the game and join the campaign of non-co-operation. I feel equally certain that the Hindus will not assist Mahomedans in promoting or bringing about an armed conflict between the British Government and their allies, and Afghanistan."

In this article Gandhiji displays great anxiety about India becoming the battle-ground between the forces of Islam and those of the English. His remedy against that evil was that the Hindus should make non-co-operation a complete and immediate success. This is downright hypocrisy. Gandhiji knew full well that the success of the movement would encourage the trans-border tribes and the Afghans to rush into India. The enemies of India would certainly sieze the opportunity when chaos and strife ruled supreme in the land. In order to convince the reader that the danger was not hypothetical, we should discuss the problem in detail. The majority of Muslim soldiers recruited in the Indian Army come from the Punjab and North West Frontier. Between these soldiers and the Afghans there is an affinity of race, language, religion and culture. Out of this affinity a sense of unity and solidarity naturally springs up. They feel that they are born comrades and always conspire to try to bring themselves under an identical type of Government. Whenever there is bad blood between the rulers of India and Afghanistan, these conspiracies amount to high treason. Sufficient proof is available to

show that the rulers of Afghanistan have made attempts to incite the Indians against the Government of India on such occasions.

To cite an instance, the Viceroy in one of his letters to Sultan Amanullah writes —

“Letter dated 29-4-1919, written by the Foreign Minister of Your Majesty, has been discovered in the papers of Your Majesty’s envoy at Simla. It instructs the envoy to make treaties of friendship with the leaders of Hindus and Muslims in India. It also contained instructions that he should incite them to write articles in the newspapers calculated to create disaffection in the minds of the people and to inform them that the golden opportunity was drawing very near. The Indian leaders were advised to continue their correspondence, without a break, with the Commander-in-Chief, Sardar Nadir Khan.”

(Parliamentary Papers, III Afghan War.)

This important extract will enlighten the reader both about the nature of the alliance between the Indian Muslims and the foreign Muslims and the precautions with which they are preserved. When this letter of the Foreign Minister of Afghan Government arrived in India, the Ali Brothers, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Hasrat Mohani and other Muslim leaders, who had been all along conspiring with the Afghans, were in jail. No prominent Hindu leader had associated himself with their conspiracy upto that moment. But by the end of the year all the Muslim leaders were set at liberty, and some of them renewed their intrigues as soon as they were out of jail. In the year 1919 the third Afghan War ended. In the August of that year an Armistice was signed between Afghanistan and India. Negotiations were started between the representatives of the two Governments with a view to transform the Armistice into a permanent alliance, at Mussooree in the summer of 1920. On the other hand the Muslim leaders of the Khilafat movement were carrying on their conspiracies with the object of re-



establishing the Khilafat, by inciting the Muslims. They had won to their fold Hindu leaders like Gandhiji and Pandit Nehru. It was against Muslim interests that a permanent treaty should be signed between the rival countries. Pandit Jawaharlal stayed at Mussooree in the month of May to watch those negotiations and to develop cordial relations with the Afghan representatives. The Pandit was suspected of carrying on prejudicial activities by the Government and was asked to quit Mussooree. After some time the order was rescinded. The two Nehrus then had interviews with the representatives of Afghanistan. As a result a treaty of permanent friendship was not signed, between the two countries in that year.

These activities of the two Nehrus must have been undertaken with full concurrence with Gandhiji. The Khilafat Committee keenly desired the breaking up of hostilities between the Government and Afghanistan. The Committee, however, agreed to experiment with non-co-operation for the time being finding that it was impossible to secure the support of Hindus in the intended war. Moreover the Muslim friends of Gandhiji had resolved to lend full sympathies to the Afghans, should they invade India under the pretext of upholding the dignity of Islam. It was extremely difficult for Gandhiji to counteract this resolve of his Islamic friends.

We leave it to our readers to judge whether our inferences are not justified by the circumstances then prevailing, and by reference to Gandhiji's own words. The Afghans had only to declare that they were out to vindicate the honour of Muslim religion—whatever their real intentions and then the Khilafat leaders including their foolish Hindu friends would go to meet and greet the invading armies as their friends.

The statement of Gandhiji, *viz.* it is difficult to resist

the Mahomedan position, gave a slight idea to some Hindu leaders of how awfully Gandhiji had lost his bearings through the fatal influence of his Muslim friends and they rebuked him for it. Thereupon to mollify these leaders Gandhiji wrote in 'Young India' of 23rd June 1920, "I consider it (the non-co-operation movement) to be perfectly consistent with my loyalty to the British connection. But I would not go with the Mussalmans in any campaign of violence. I could not help them in promoting for instance an invasion of India through Afghanistan or otherwise for the purpose of forcing better peace terms. It is I hold, the duty of every Hindu to resist any inroad on India, even for the purpose specified."

Three undertakings are contained in the above statement. The first is, to the effect that the acceptance of the principle and programme of non-co-operation does not adversely affect the connection with the British Government. The second is, he would never help the Mussalmans to bring about the Afghan invasion on India and the last, that it is the duty of every Hindu to resist the Afghan invasion should they deem it fit to do so even under the disguise of maintaining the Khilafat. Gandhiji violated all these undertakings. We shall deal with this subject in detail, by collecting all the fresh evidence available so far, in the following chapters.

## AFGHAN EMISSARIES

Although upto the end of June Gandhiji had been reiterating in his writings that participation in the Khilafat movement did not affect his loyalty to the British Crown, the view held by Ali Brothers was entirely different. In those days it was their sole occupation to carry on conspiracies with the enemies of the British Empire. Prof. Rushbrook Williams in his annual report for the year 1921, clearly states, "To the consternation of many of his co-religionists Mr. Gandhi struck up a working alliance with Mahomed Ali and Shaukat Ali, the two pan-Islam extremists, who after being interned during the war years for their open championship of the cause of Turkey, and persistent intrigues with the enemies of the Empire, had recently been released by Royal Clemency." In this sentence the authorised historian of the Government of India makes a specific charge against the Ali Brothers that they were continually conspiring with the enemies of the Empire. When the Brothers were released in accordance with the Royal proclamation, they made strenuous effort to give a broad and more extensive form to their intrigues in 1920.

The activities of the Ali Brothers in 1920 are summarised by Prof. Rushbrook Williams in the following terms, "Already in the beginning of March Government had found it necessary to issue a resolution pointing out the impossibility of Government servants joining in the celebrations of the 19th March as a day of fast and mourning on behalf of Turkey. The necessity for this had arisen from the fact that Mr. Shaukat Ali had issued a manifesto announcing that

among the resolutions to be placed before the meetings fixed for the 19th March was one containing the threat that if the peace terms did not conform with certain requirements, Muslims would be forced to sever their loyal connection with the British throne." No one can honestly propound that Gandhiji had no inkling of this affair upto the end of June. In spite of all this one wonders at his audacity in writing in the month of June, articles, asserting that the non-co-operation movement was consistent with loyalty to the British Government.

In a way the article in June penned by Gandhiji contained a partial truth, because he had not so far made up his mind to change the Congress Creed. In 1920 a sub-committee was appointed by A. I. C. C. to revise the Congress constitution and as Gandhiji informs us in his autobiography he was himself at the head of the sub-committee. There was sharp difference of opinion between Gandhiji and a distinguished leader of Madras Mr. A. Rangaswami Ayengar, with regard to the procedure of this committee. Mr Ayengar issued a statement referring to this incident. In this connection the 'Indian Social Reformer' in its issue of 21-11-1920 says, "He mentions that so late as August last, Mr. Gandhi had not thought it necessary to leave the question of continuance within the British Empire, an open question. In fact, Mr. Gandhi himself had drafted a creed in which such continuance was expressly affirmed. About the middle of September Mr. Gandhi seems to have arrived at his later view." We can fix the probable cause of this change of outlook on the part of Gandhiji by the help of inference. Many persons might be remembering the fact that Gandhiji included the term Swaraj, in the aims and objects of non-co-operation, at Calcutta Congress, at the express wish of Pandit Motilal Nehru. It has already been pointed out that the two Nehrus were

carrying on secret negotiations with the father-in-law of Sultan Amanullah, the foreign minister, Mahamud Tarzi. The Afghan deputation, along with Sardar Mahamud Tarzi returned to Kabul from Mussooree by the last week of July. The deputation submitted a report of their work in India to the Amir in the month of August. Thereafter the Afghan Government must have communicated their plan of action to Pandit Motilal Nehru, who was then the President of the Congress. Gandhiji must have been convinced of the necessity of modifying the creed of the Congress as a result of this communication. Mr. Jinnah realised the true significance of the plot to change the Congress Creed and also conveyed it to Mr. Rangaswami Ayengar. The 'Citizen' of Madras dated 20-11-1920 published the following paragraph, "It must also be said that at one time Mr. Ayengar would appear to have agreed to the revision of Article one, made by Mr. Gandhi as published, though he changed it soon after a conversation he had with Mr. Jinnah, as to the real aim of some other Congressmen who pressed for these changes." Mr. Jinnah's speech at Nagpur Congress reveals plainly who those Congressmen were. While delivering a speech on the resolution to modify the creed at Nagpur, Mr. Jinnah said, "I do not say that Mr. Mahomed Ali did not give other reasons, but the only reason that I understood, was this, that in order to enable certain people who are not willing to sign the present Congress Creed, it is necessary to change the creed." Several people like the Ali Brothers were not prepared to sign the Congress Creed as it then stood. They therefore, insisted upon the change of creed. Efforts, to win the aid of foreign nations to the Indian National Movement had then recently begun. The leaders, engaged in these efforts were gradually becoming cognisant of the fact that it was impossible to secure the sympathy of outside nations for

the struggle for Home Rule within the limits of the British Empire. Miss Agnes Smedley, an American lady has published a letter in the issue of January 1921 of the 'Modern Review.' In that letter she says, "America does not understand that India wishes Home Rule within the Empire. America if it thinks at all, and a large majority are doing so today, wishes for India an entirely independent existence as a free and independent nation. We will support you in a straight, frank courageous plan of freedom." We perceive from the above statement in what way the political intrigues with foreign powers were interlinked with the problem of changing the Congress Creed. None can deny the correlation between them.

Many a nation has been compelled to accept the aid of the foreign powers for the attainment of political liberty. Weak nations will resort to the same expedient whenever they are in earnest about breaking their bonds.

There is nothing dishonourable, in principle about it. But great precaution must be exercised while obtaining the foreign aid. The problem has to be handled with extreme tact, pros and cons have to be seriously contemplated upon. If we commit the slightest error, the so-called helpers might usurp the place of our present masters. Perhaps the new masters might be worse than the present ones. It would be like jumping from the boiling pot into a frying pan. Now in 1920 could it be honestly maintained that the Afghans offered help only on account of the righteousness of the Indian cause? Do we not know that cunning people always conceal their real intentions under the cloak of piety and philanthropy? On account of the perverted philosophy of Gandhiji he did not think it necessary to bestow any thought upon this problem. There is the gravamen of our charge against him. While replying to the objections of Bipinbabu, Gandhiji writes in

'Young India' of 1-6-1921, "The whole scheme of non-co-operation is based on trusting other people and if they prove untrustworthy, on our being prepared to meet their deceit by selfsuffering." Kunti asked a boon of Lord Shri Krishna विपदः सन्तु नः शब्दत् (Grant us eternal suffering). One is put in mind of this boon by the words of Gandhiji. Kunti however was thinking of spiritual salvation. Gandhiji on the other hand was dealing with a tough political problem. He was introducing the way of a masochistic sadhu into everyday politics, inflicting thereby infinite mischief on this unfortunate nation.

Gandhiji had made it quite plain as to the nation on which India was to place her implicit trust. He writes in 'Young India' of 18-5-1921, "I therefore so far as my creed of non-violence is concerned, can contemplate an Afghan invasion with perfect equanimity and equally so far as India's safety is concerned. The Afghans have no quarrel with India. They are God-fearing people. I warn non-co-operators against judging the Afghans by the few savage specimens we see in Bombay and Calcutta. It is a superstition to suppose they will overrun India, if the British post at the frontier was withdrawn." In this statement Gandhiji shows himself a second Nero. While the city of Rome was burning, Nero was engrossed in playing with his fiddle with perfect equanimity! We see how Gandhiji's creed of non-violence borders on utter callousness and brutality. The creed would be becoming to an ascetic spending his life in a lonely Himalayan cave, but it is inexcusable for a politician upon whose actions the fate of the country largely depends. The statement also betrays utter lack of commonsense and knowledge of Indian History. Had Afghans any quarrel with India in ancient times when they rushed like an avalanche through the Khyber Pass, into the rich plains of India?

The fact is that strong and aggressive people like the Afghans need no quarrel to attack their neighbour whenever he shows signs of weakness. Gandhiji, blinded by his zeal for the Khilafat, offers a certificate to the Afghan people. 'They are a God-fearing people.' It passes our understanding how he could judge a nation without studying their history or acquainting himself with Afghan life at close quarters by living amongst them. We judge a people by their visible acts. Was Mahmud of Gazani a God-fearing Afghan? Were his 12 excursions into India solely undertaken to make the God-less Indians God-fearing? The tragedy is that Gandhiji corrupts and distorts everything that he handles. His inner voice—can it be the voice of his Muslim advisers—is a most treacherous guide when he relies upon it to appraise the virtues of a foreign nation. He contradicts himself when he says 'it is a superstition to suppose that they will over-run India etc.' If it is a *superstition*, why does he advise Indians, especially Hindus to be prepared to meet Afghan deceit by self-suffering? Again if an unequivocal verdict of History be a superstition what may be the correct faith? In reality his scheme of non-co-operation based on infinite trust on other people is a monstrous superstition; it runs counter to the wholesome dictum न विश्वसेदविश्वस्ते विश्वस्ते नातिविश्वसेत्.

Hindus are now being convinced that the Ali Brothers were carrying on intrigues with Afghanistan. But they are extremely reluctant to admit that Gandhiji was involved in those intrigues. In 'Young India' of 4-5-1921, he writes, "I would, in a sense certainly assist the Amir of Afghanistan if he waged war against the British Government. That is to say I would openly tell my countrymen that it would be a crime to help a Government which had lost the confidence of the nation to remain in power." This passage reveals



Gandhiji's earnest desire for the Afghan invasion. It was natural that Gandhiji should get himself involved in plots for the consummation of this wish. We also draw the attention of such Hindus to another sentence of his. "I refuse to be considered so simple as to be readily taken in by my companions." ('Young India' 13-4-1921). It is our experience that if a person knowingly commits acts of apparent folly it is hazardous to dub those acts as acts of a fool unless we are thoroughly assured that there is no mysterious purpose underlying them.

It is essential to bring prominently to the view of the reader an incident that happened at the Nagpur Congress when the resolution on 'Swaraj' was before the subjects-committee. The following extract from the article of Babu Bipinchandra Pal appeared in 'Comrade' (4-9-1925), edited by Mahomed Ali. "The Congress started in 1920 with a new creed and constitution framed by Mr. Gandhi. In this constitution Swaraj was declared to be the goal of our national endeavours. But the Mahatma would not define Swaraj. He would not allow any one else to do so. Mr. Mahomed Ali gave me the reason of it. In course of a conversation I had with him on the subject at Mr. Byomkesh Chakravarty's place in the heyday of N. C. O. campaign. I then learned that Swaraj was left without any definition, because the moment we tried to do so, the unity in the Congress would break up. At Nagpur, I moved an amendment to Mr. Gandhi's draft, adding the adjective democratic to the word Swaraj and rendering it into English as full responsible government. That amendment was supported by Mr. Das ; but Gandhi opposed it and it was necessarily lost. My amendment was opposed by a prominent non-co-operator who openly declared that he saw no reason why we should not welcome an autocracy like that of Ranjeet Singh, if it

would replace the present foreign domination. That speech, which was more or less openly applauded, was a clear indication of the political philosophy of those who declared that they were out to destroy the Satanic British Empire; but this opposition to define our objective and clarify our vision of the ideal which we were pursuing, concealed also deliberate design. I cannot believe that such astute politicians as the Ali Brothers did not realise the confusion of thinking, which characterised the whole non-co-operation campaign; but they were only interested in helping the destruction of the present government leaving the future to take care of itself."

It was quite natural for Ali Brothers and other Muslims of their type to wish the destruction of the British Government, because they were aware that in the chaotic state and anarchy that would ensue, the Amir of Afghanistan would have an excellent opportunity to overrun India and establish Muslim sovereignty over the country. They would have easily secured Gandhiji's consent to this type of Swaraj. Answering the criticism of Bipin Babu Mahomed Ali contented himself with the remark "I voted against your amendment because I did not believe in tautology. I am convinced that Swaraj cannot be anything else than democratic." The point is that the Ali Brothers wanted full scope to pursue their foreign intrigues. The Hindus who had become blind to the distinction between the self-government and the autocratic Muslim domination could not reasonably be expected to differentiate between autocracy and democracy. The statement of Mahomed Ali to the effect that if the term Swaraj be defined it would put an end to the unity in the Congress, is worth reflection. Of the two conciliations, *viz.* the one between the Moderates and Extremists, and the other between the Hindus and Muslims, effected at Lucknow, the former was already wrecked even before the Congress

Session at Nagpur; we infer therefore that Mahomed Ali meant that the definition of Swaraj would create a fissure in Hindu-Muslim unity. Nationalist leaders like Messrs. Das, Pal, Satyamurti and Rangaswami Ayengar, insisted upon the definition of the term Swaraj, at the Nagpur Congress. But waiving aside this rational outlook of prominent leaders Gandhiji caused the Congress to assent to the resolution containing the vague term Swaraj, so that he and his associates should have freedom to carry on secret plots with Afganistan. It is proposed to lay before the reader some of the evidence which has been collected from contemporary periodicals, proving the guilt of Gandhiji and his Muslim comrades. We are now quoting original English passages with a view to substantiate our charges against Gandhiji, that it may set at rest doubts entertained by our fastidious and inquisitive readers.

The 'Indian Review' of January 1921 refers to special messengers sent by Amir Amanullah to Ali Brothers. While narrating the proceedings of the Khilafat Conference at Nagpur, it states "Mr. Shaukat Ali then announced amidst acclamation that Amir Amanullah had sent a message of condolence at the death of Sheikh-ul-Hind Mohammad-ul-Hussain. Thereupon it was decided to thank the Amir for his message on behalf of all communities of India."

One may ask why this privilege of thanking the Amir was forcibly thrust upon Hindus and other non-Muslim communities in India. They were totally unconcerned whether Sheikh-ul-Hind lived or died. The cunning Khilafatists wanted to create a fictitious semblance of solidarity; that is why they unauthorisedly associated other communities with the condolence. Let us inquire who this Sheikh-ul-Hind was. What was it that prompted the Amir to send a message of condolence to the Khilafat Conference at his death?

Suffice it to say that he was a leading member of the conspiracy known as "Silk Letters Conspiracy," conducted by Indian Muslim divines with the object of helping Turkey in the last war. He was also referred to as 'our Peshwa' by Hakim Ajmalkhan and other leaders in their speeches at the Muslim League Conference, held at Amritsar. The fact that Amir Amanullah communicated his special message, at the demise of such a worthy personage, to the Khilafat Conference, drives home to us how intimately the Khilafat conspirators were interlinked with the politics of Afghanistan. The Amir had sent this message through the agency of two Maulanas who were a party to the above conspiracy. Space forbids us from giving the information about these Maulanas.

Swami Shraddhanand had published the following regarding Amir's emissaries in his paper 'Shraddha' and it also occurred in 'New Empire' Calcutta, in the first week of May 1921.

"Referring to the threat of the Hon. Dr. Tej Bahadur Sapru, Mr. Mohamed Ali said in a speech at Madras that it had to do with a letter written by him in which he had given a clear warning to the Government of India that if the Amir of Afghanistan invaded India not to make slaves of the Indian population but to fight against his enemies and to redress the Khilafat wrong it would be the duty of all Mahomedans to rise in arms against the Englishmen. But in my opinion Dr. Sapru's threat is not based on that letter at all, it has to do with a story which was related to me by a gentleman in confidence of most of the leaders of the Moderate party. It runs thus:—

"About 3 or 4 months back an emissary of the Afghan Government came to Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and asked him if the Hindus would welcome the Amir in case the latter invaded this country. Pandit Malaviya, to put him off, referred him to Mahatma Gandhi, who in his turn

asked him to go to the Ali Brothers. After a good deal of talk with him, Mr. Mahomed Ali gave him a letter addressed to the Amir saying that both the Hindus and Mahomedans would be with him in case of any invasion by him. The letter further said : " The army has not yet come under our control ; the invasion should take place only when we are assured of its support."

It is said the emissary departed with the letter, but that he was bribed by the Government of India into delivering the letter into their hands and into making a clean breast of everything to them. It is further said that Dr. Sapru later on verified the story by asking Pandit Malaviya himself about it.

Enumerating the questions that arise in this connection and asking Government to distribute fascimiles of the letter, if it has really got it, Swami Shraddhanand observes :—

"I should like to say explicitly that no matter whether other Hindus support the Amir in a situation like this, I for one would not be prepared to go with my countrymen in case of such a Jihad. A Swaraj obtained by means like this is utterly worthless. Even if paradise be obtained with the help of a neighbour it becomes worse than hell later on. No matter what the weapon employed to obtain Swaraj, only that Swaraj can be everlasting which is acquired by the strength of our own arms and which accords with the self-determination of the Indian people."

The story of the Afghan spy as published by the Swamiji was contradicted by both the Alis and Gandhiji. But it was not contradicted by Dr. Sapru. The story had some flaws in it, as the Afghan who visited Malaviyaji was a different person from the two Maulanas who approached the Alis at Nagpur and took away their letter. The incident of the letter was quite correct.

Malaviyaji reports the incident of the spy as follows :—

“About a year ago, I think it was a little before the Khilafat Conference met at Allahabad, an Afghan came to me at Benares. He said he had been sent by some leading persons in Afghanistan, that the Amirsahib and the leading men of Afghanistan closely watched our fight with the British Government and deeply sympathised with us, that the Afghans were willing to come to India to help us against the British Government, but that they wanted to know whether and how far in my opinion the Hindus of this country would support the Afghans if they came to fight the British Government... I said to him I was thankful to those who had sent him for their sympathy towards us, that I too had a deep sympathy with Afghanistan, that we were endeavouring in our own way to obtain freedom and that I sincerely desired Afghanistan to preserve its independence and not to risk it in an attempt to help us against the British Government.”

The stand taken up by Malaviyaji with regard to the Afghan spy was most sensible and diplomatic. It reflected a genuine national sentiment.

The letter written by Mahomed Ali to the Amir must have been drafted only after a prolonged discussion between Gandhiji and Ali Brothers inasmuch as some sentences in the letter are identical with those found in the writings of Gandhiji upon the Afghan affair. For instance after the publication of the episode, Gandhiji writes in ‘Young India,’ “In these circumstances I do not delude myself with the belief that the British Government will be without Indian help in the event of an immediate Afghan invasion.” “What however I would do is totally different from what I can do. I am sorry to have to confess that the movement has not yet acquired such hold on the soldierclass as to embolden them to refuse assistance to the Government.” (18-5-21). The plan was that Afghanistan should invade India from outside. The Ali Brothers and other traitors were to do their best to incite the Indian troops to disobey

Government orders from within. In accordance with this plan the Ali Brothers brought forward a resolution that soldiers should resign their jobs, before the Khilafat Conference at Karachi in September and got it approved. On November 10 Gandhiji wrote in 'Young India' "He (the Civil resister) may refuse to obey the law of trespass and claim to enter the military barracks in order to speak to the soldiers." This was the real plan of the conspirators. How keen the Muslims were on seducing the Army can well be seen from the following information regarding the origin of Hindu Mahasabha published by Swami Shraddhanand in 'Liberator,' 19-8-1926:—

"Another important business transacted at that time was a special conference of the Hindus held on the 7th and 8th November 1921, in order to adopt the programme of non-violent non-co-operation of the Congress against the Government for disregarding the repeated requests of the Hindu Community as regards the protection of cows. Hakeem Mohd. Ajmal Khan acted as Chairman of the Reception Committee and gave a very novel advice. Of course the following resolutions were bound to be passed.

"This All-India Hindu Mahasabha fully accepts the resolution of the Sub Committee appointed at Brindaban 'that for the protection of cows the full programme of non-violent non-co-operation which is being worked under the aegis of the Congress be adopted' and exhorts all Hindus to consider it their duty to act accordingly."

A further resolution laid down "Whereas the advent of the Heir-apparent is the means of strengthening the power of the British Government therefore it is the religious duty of every Hindu to boycott it completely, to boycott foreign cloth and to use pure Swadeshi, and as in the Cantonments lakhs of cows are slaughtered annually, therefore, under such conditions no Hindu should serve the *British Government specially in the Police and Military Departments and generally in other departments.*" It was the first time that I was induced to join the Hindu Mahasabha and when a Sub-committee was appointed to give effect to the above resolutions I was appointed its president.

But there was one resolution adopted at the suggestion of Hakeem Ajmal Khan which had a peculiar meaning for

the non-co-operators. It ran as follows : " This Mahasabha respectfully entreats the Dharmacharyas, learned Sadhus and Pandits to give a vyavastha ( fiat ), according to the Vedas and Shastras, for non-cooperation with the English Government which allow cow-killing so that the Hindus' life-giving mother cow might be protected. "

Hakeemsahib had already laid the foundation of the 'Jamaiyat-i-ulema' which inculcated strong Fatwas against the British Government for the protection of the Khilafat and his suggestion was to organise a similar Jamaiyat of Pandits to give vyavastha against the devilish Government which allowed slaughter of the cows. "

Gandhiji was fully alive to the dangers inherent in these machinations. He writes in 'Young India' of 1-6-1921, " In theory it is possible to distinguish between an invasion of India and an invasion of the British Government for the purpose of the Khilafat. In practice, I do not believe in the Afghan invading India to embarrass the Government and being able in the event of being successful to resist the temptation of establishing a kingdom in India. ( Note :— We wonder that god-fearing peoples like the Afghans are ever tempted by Devil.) In spite of such belief I hold it to be contrary to the faith of a non-co-operator to render unconditional assistance to a Government which he seeks to end or mend. " " I would rather see India perish at the hands of Afghans than purchase freedom from Afghan invasion at the cost of her honour. " Gandhiji is seen here in his true colours. He would not assist the British Government even for the purpose of saving millions of his countrymen from the terrible fate of indiscriminate slaughter, pillage and incendiarism at the hands of uncivilized invaders. The reader should note how flagrantly Gandhiji violates his three undertakings mentioned before.

Gandhiji was inextricably involved in the conspiracies of the Khilafatists. Once this important fact is driven home, one begins to review the history of the non-co-operation move-



ment with entirely a new angle of vision. One suspects very strongly that one of the many reasons that prompted leaders like Gandhiji to declare a complete boycott on the reception of the Prince of Wales, was to impress on the Sultan of Kabul that Indians were extremely impatient to welcome the Afghans as their deliverers.

As a final stroke of Gandhiji's unscrupulous way of thinking we cite the following passage of his ('Young India', 18-5-1921), "Let us remember that there is nothing to prevent them (the Afghans) from overrunning India today if they wished to." The reader will be tempted to inquire whether the God-fearing Afghans would not be deterred from the wicked act of harassing their peaceful neighbours. In the light of these writings of Gandhiji, it is not surprising that he wrote the draft of the telegram viz. "Don't sign the treaty. Situation in India hopeful." sent to Amir Amanullah by Mahomed Ali.

There was a panic in Indian political circles at the news of the telegram sent by Mahomed Ali to the Amir. Hindu leaders naturally blamed Mahomed Ali for his imprudent action. He had shown the draft of the telegram to Swami Shraddhanand. Swamiji was wonderstruck when he recognised the peculiar handwriting of Gandhiji. It was clear that Mahomed Ali's guilt was shared by Gandhiji. Swamiji's veracity is beyond dispute. Being endowed with a high sense of public duty he courageously disclosed many inconvenient truths. Gandhiji himself acknowledged this trait of Swamiji upon the latter's death. Says Gandhiji in 'Young India' in the beginning of 1927 :--' He blurted out truth as he knew it.' But as soon as we quoted an extract from Swami Shraddhanand's writings Gandhiji called into question Swamiji's love for truth. Gandhiji says in 'Harijan' of 10-2-1940 :—

"I do not remember having drafted any telegram on behalf of Maulana Mahomed Ali to the then Amir. The

**alleged telegram is harmless in itself and does not warrant the deduction drawn from it. The late Swamiji never referred the matter to me for confirmation."**

We do realise that on account of his senility, coupled with the leadership of a political party, Gandhiji's memory may serve him very badly. He should at least take care to see that his forgetfulness does not defame his bosom friends. His statement amounts to this : Since he has not drafted the telegram it must have been forged by his dear friend Mr. Mahomed Ali with the object of implicating Gandhiji in the plot. Does he seriously suspect that his friend must have committed forgery? We humbly request Gandhiji that he should either appoint remembrancer or take immediate steps to strengthen his memory if he wishes to safeguard the reputation of his friends.

As soon as Nagpur Congress gave its assent to the alteration of the creed, Gandhiji and the Ali Brothers began to misuse the resolution. The fact can be verified from the following resolution passed by the Muslim League, immediately after the Congress Session at Nagpur.

**"In view of the fact that the Indian National Congress, the All India Muslim League, the Sikh League, the Khilafat Conference and other public bodies have declared the resolution of attaining Swaraj, and in view of the fact that the alliance of the neighbouring state with Great Britain is conceived not as a plan for the protection of India but for strengthening the British hold on India, and in view of the fact that India had no quarrel with Afghanistan inasmuch as Great Britain has been able, mainly through her Empire in India to disrupt the dominions of the Khilafat, the All India Muslim League begs respectfully to advise His Majesty Ghazi Amir Amanullah Khan, the independent ruler of Afghanistan, to reject any advance on the part of the Government of India for a treaty alliance with Great Britain. In view of the further fact that this League is confident that neither the peoples of Afghanistan nor their Government has any designs on the independent existence of the people of India, this League hopes that both the nations will cultivate friendly**

relations between themselves and learn to rely on each other's good-will."

This League Resolution is extremely deceptive. It was purposely worded in soothing language to lull the Hindus into a false sense of safety. If the reader compares it with several utterances of Gandhiji and his Muslim co-conspirators he will be struck with the dissonance between them. Mahomed Ali, in his Madras speech, categorically asserted 'that if the Amir of Afghanistan were to invade India, not aggressively but for the liberation of the country from an infidel yoke, it would be the duty of all Muslims to assist him actively', and Gandhiji, to uphold the prestige of his partner in the unholy pact was ever ready to plunge his country into a chaotic condition. If the British supremacy in India can be called 'an infidel yoke', Hindu majority in the country can be equally galling to the followers of Islam. From the standpoint of orthodox Muslims, Christian rulers are far better than the Hindus, who have no religion founded on a Book.

As the Congress and other organisations had resolved on winning Swaraj, henceforth all the enemies of the Government of India were to be looked upon as friends of the Indian people. The League Resolution was drafted on the same principle. It plainly states that although the Government of India may not be on friendly terms with Afghanistan, Indian people have no quarrel with the Afghans, that the Indian people are prepared to have cordial relations with their neighbours and that Indians are willing to rely on the good-will of Afghanistan in the matter of National Security. In the Khilafat Conference held at Coçanada Shaukat Ali himself exposed the authorship of and the motives underlying the League Resolution.

"In the Nagpur Khilafat Conference, Mahatma Gandhi had moved a resolution which was seconded by me, that

his Majesty the Amir of Afghanistan should not make a treaty with that Government with which we had non-co-operated; on the other hand he should make treaty with the Hindus and Mussalmans of India so that we may pass our days in peace in one another's neighbourhood."

Shaukat Ali was conscious of the fact that by his subversive activities he was playing the role of an agent to a foreign Government and it was not unlikely that he might have to forfeit his life by way of penalty. Mr. Marmaduke Pikthal, the then editor of the 'Chronicle,' in the course of an article on the Nagpur Congress observed :—

"Shaukat Ali, that most simple and sincere of men, spoke to me as one prepared for death at any moment and showed some reason for his expectation in the false testimony which is being borne against him and his brother by the Information Department through the Anglo-Indian Press."

At this time serious allegations were being published in the Anglo-Indian press regarding the intrigues of Ali Brothers with a foreign power. Unless these allegations contained substantial truth Shaukat Ali had no reason to fear the gallows. If he were quite innocent, he had not the slightest cause to get nervous. For the satisfaction of those who might hold this proof to be insufficient we quote a relevant passage from 'Young India' dated 4-5-1921. The following question was put to Gandhiji by a Muslim named Mr. Afhad Hussain.

"You know that Maulana Mohamed Ali has publicly declared from a platform in the Madras Presidency that he would assist the Amir of Afghanistan if he came towards India against those who have emasculated Islam and who are in wrongful possession of the Holy Places etc. I think Indian opinion is divided on this question. The Moderates are bent upon crushing any such movement. Even the nationalists such as Lala Lajpat Rai and Messrs. Das and Malaviya, have not spoken out their mind—nay even you have not taken any notice of this very important speech. It may be high treason to show sympathy and give open assistance to King's enemy, but in these days of frank talk and candid speech one is eager to hear the decision of leaders. It is a vital question."

The plain meaning of this brazen question is, "Gandhiji, are you prepared to commit the crime of high treason?" Before giving Gandhiji's reply to the above query it is necessary to explain the term treason.

Treason to one's country must be distinguished from disloyalty to or hatred of the established Government. Indian people have suffered alien domination for centuries and consequently have, for the most part, lost sight of the duties they owe to their motherland. As a result we fail to notice at once the guilt of treason incurred by some of our countrymen in the heat of expressing the natural hatred of the foreigners who are masters of the country. Treason to one's country denotes alliance with the enemy of the motherland and inciting the latter (enemy) to attack one's country. Sedition or disloyalty is altogether different from treason. To rebel against the established authority of the country, either with a view to reform the state or overthrow alien masters, relying upon our inherent strength, is designated as sedition. Men, who love liberty but are labouring under the handicap of a foreign yoke, are naturally proud of the revolutionaries who commit the crime of sedition. Owing to the deep love and reverence for the revolutionaries, those who oppose their policy by helping the Government, are wrongly stigmatized as traitors to the nation (e.g. the Moderates who supported the Government to save the country from anarchy). So long as the revolutionaries have not established a parallel Government which is capable of functioning any help given to the Government established by law cannot be a treason to the nation. Bearing in mind this vital difference between treason and disloyalty or sedition, the reader is requested to peruse the following account.

In the course of his reply to Afhad Hussain Gandhiji says, "I have not read Maulana Mahomed Ali's speech referred

to by the correspondent. But whether he does or not, I would in a sense, certainly assist the Amir of Afghanistan if he waged war against the British Government. That is to say I would openly tell my countrymen that it would be a crime to help the Government which has lost the confidence of the nation to remain in power." The question whether a dependent country like India, in the event of breaking up of hostilities between the foreign ruling government and their enemy, should or should not lend assistance to the former, is very important. Our unhesitating reply is that we must support to the utmost of our capacity our present rulers if we do not wish that they should be superceded by their enemy. In 'Harijan' of 10-2-1940, while denying the allegation of carrying secret negotiations with the Amir, Gandhiji writes "In any case, I have no desire to substitute British rule with any foreign rule." But in 1921 he had made a statement which totally contradicts his modern view. He had said "I would rather see India perish at the hands of Afghans than purchase freedom from Afghan invasion at the cost of her honour" (1-6-1921) 'Young India.' We are in complete accord with Gandhiji's statement of 10-2-40. But as he not infrequently non-cooperates by his actions with his words, he cannot be congratulated upon his fine words. Gandhiji published in 'Young India' of 4-5-1921, the article on Afghan Bogey. Immediately afterwards Rev. C. F. Andrews rebuked Gandhiji for it. Thereupon he wrote in 'Young India' of 18-5-1921, by way of reply "Is not my article on the Afghan Bogey an invitation to the Afghans to invade the Indian border and thus do I not become a direct party to violence?" Thus asks Mr. Andrews. "My article was written for Indians and for the Government. I do not believe the Afghans to be so foolish as to invade India on the strength of my article. But I see that it is capable of bearing the interpretation put

upon it by Mr. Andrews. I therefore hasten to inform all those whom it may concern, that not only do I not want to invite the Afghans or any body to come to our assistance but I am anxious for them not to come to our assistance. I am quite confident of India's ability to settle with the Government without extraneous help. Moreover, I am interested in demonstrating the perfect possibility of attaining our end only by non-violent means."

The entire passage is replete with sophistry. The Afghans on account of their superior statesmanship and sense of reality did not act upon the foolish advice tendered gratis by Gandhiji and his fellow-conspirators, but that in no way absolves them from the heinous crime of treason. We have already indicated how he gloats upon the idea of devastation and bloodshed to safeguard his wretched honour. In spite of his hypocritical protestations to the contrary, he an innocent white lamb cannot screen from the view of the shrewd, his genuine character as a blood-thirsty Moloch. The reader will at once detect the fact that Gandhiji himself has admitted in 'Young India' of 18-5-1921 that his article viz. the 'Afghan Bogey' is capable of being construed as an invitation to Afghanistan to invade India. But when we levelled the same charge against him, assuming the air of injured innocence, he meekly paraded his grievance before the public. (Vide 'Harijan' 10-2-1940) :—

"A romance has been woven round my writings in 'Young India.' We could not refute this pretention earlier because the conclusive evidence could not be discovered in the edition of 'Young India,' edited by Dr. Rajendra Babu. In that edition Babuji has suppressed certain writings of his 'Guru', damaging to his reputation. We had wrongly assumed that Babuji had some sense of honesty and integrity. The relevant part of the passage we have quoted above is conven-

iently missing in Babuji's edition. The apostle of non-violence who was only interested in demonstrating to the world the success of his idiotic method and who was quite confident of India's ability to win Swaraj from the Government without foreign help, forgot what he wrote a month earlier. In 'Young India' (13-4-1921), while replying to the criticism of the 'Times of India,' he says, "It is no use isolating me from the rest." "As Maulana Mahomed Ali often puts it, war is bad but there are worse things than war." "The Brothers are honestly and industriously endeavouring to secure a peaceful settlement. But should their effort prove vain, either for want of response from the Government or the people, as lovers of their faith, they will not hesitate to precipitate war if they could. As for my own attitude, whilst my faith would not permit me to invite or encourage a war of violence I do contemplate with equanimity a state of war in preference to the present state of effeminate peace imposed by force of arms. And it is for that reason that I am taking part in this movement of non-violent non-co-operation even at the risk of anarchy being the ultimate result."

On the 13th April, Gandhiji was quite prepared to face the risk of anarchy if his non-co-operation movement led him to that bloody and violent goal. He talked of things which were worse than a state of war. A month after, on the 18th May 1921, the desperate stand taken a month earlier vanished all of a sudden and he indulged in the talk of extreme non-violence. This dramatic transformation was the result of Gandhiji's interview with Lord Reading. The interview was brought about by Pandit Malaviya with the object of foiling the conspiracies which were being carried on by the Ali Brothers and Gandhiji with Afghanistan. Gandhiji saw the Viceroy on the 13th, 16th, 17th and 18th. On this occasion Lord Reading made full use of his ability in ex-



tracting a confession favourable to the Government, just as a good advocate obtains a confession favourable to his client from the depositions tendered by the witness of the opposite party, and forced Gandhiji to tender an indirect apology. When we compare this veiled apology of 18th May with the apology given by the Ali Brothers the situation becomes quite clear. To enable the reader to compare the two apologies we quote the apology of Ali Brothers. "Friends have drawn our attention to certain speeches of ours which, in their opinion, have a tendency to incite to violence. We desire to state that we never intended to incite to violence and we never imagined that any passage in our speeches were capable of bearing the interpretation put upon them; but we recognize the force of our friends' argument and interpretation. We therefore sincerely feel sorry and express our regret for the unnecessary heat of some of our passages in these speeches and give our public assurances and promise to all who may require it, that so long as we are associated with the movement of non-co-operation we shall not directly or indirectly advocate violence at present and in the future, nor create an atmosphere of preparedness for violence. Indeed we hold it contrary to the spirit of non-violent non-co-operation to which we have pledged our word."

Under the cloak of offering an explanation to friends this apology was in fact, one offered to Government, as was the case with Gandhiji's article. Gandhiji had said about his co-conspirators (Ali Brothers) that as lovers of their faith (Islam) they would not hesitate to precipitate war if they could, failing peaceful efforts. In the apology, the Ali Brothers posed themselves as meek and faithful followers of non-violence. In the light of their violent speeches none can believe their words 'We desire to state we never in-

tended to incite to violence.' The Government, in forcing them to apologize, secured a great moral victory. The apology given by Gandhiji was more thorough than that of the Ali Brothers. We give below an excerpt from the agreed statement, issued by the Government with the concurrence of Gandhiji, to substantiate this charge.

"Mr. Gandhi telegraphed to His Excellency that Messrs. Shaukat Ali and Mahomed Ali had signed the statement, with an immaterial alteration and sent it to the press for publication. The alteration was as follows; the passage in Mr. Gandhi's draft statement was, we desire to state that we never intended to incite to violence. but we recognize that certain passages in our speeches are capable of bearing the interpretation put upon them."

The Ali Brothers objected to Gandhiji's draft and toned down the sentence quoted above. In Gandhiji's article the original statement in the draft remained intact. Consequently the apology of Gandhiji was more explicit than that of the Ali Brothers. The sentence altered by the Ali Brothers is found in the veiled apology of Gandhiji without any alteration.

It is quite evident that an apology of this nature can not have been given voluntarily. He would have replied to Mr. Andrews in much the same manner as he replied to us; he would have fled at a tangent while replying. But the occasion was such that the satisfaction of Mr. Andrews alone was not sufficient, in addition he had to set at rest the suspicions of the Viceroy. Therefore willynilly he had to admit his guilt. The usual policy of the Government being 'Divide and Rule,' they intended to disgrace on that occasion, the Ali Brothers alone; no hubbub therefore of Gandhiji's indirect apology published in 'Young India.' No body took a special notice of Gandhiji's reply given in indecent haste to Mr. Andrews, because the public was in the dark about its background.

## MUSLIM RAJ IN INDIA

To prove that the allegiance of Gandhiji to the doctrine of extreme non-violence is superficial and bogus, we give below an incident. Even after the apology referred to in the previous Chapter the conspiracies with Afghanistan continued as before. Everything was in readiness for the mass civil disobedience at Bardoli. It was unexpectedly called off on the flimsy excuse of the murder of some policemen at the hands of the violent mob at Chaurichaura. That atrocious act took place on 4-2-1922. Three days after (7-2-22) Gandhiji wrote to the Viceroy as follows: "The choice before the people is mass civil disobedience with all its undoubted dangers and lawless repression of the lawful activities of the people. I hold that it is impossible for any body of self-respecting men for fear of unknown dangers to sit still and do nothing effective when looting of property and assaulting innocent men are going on all over the country in the name of law and order." This reply shows that Gandhiji was fully prepared to face unknown dangers resulting from his campaign of mass civil disobedience, even after the atrocities at Chaurichaura. But this resolve of Gandhiji evaporated by the 11th. What had transpired during these four days which led him to change his mind? It was the fact that the treaty agreed with Afghanistan on 22-11-1921, received the assent of His Majesty George V on 6-2-1922 and became operative from that date. Gandhiji abandoned his campaign immediately after learning of this ratification. During these days Maulana Azad Sobhani was the principal adviser to Gandhiji, in all foreign intrigues. In order to

give an insight to the reader as regards how Maulana Azad Sobhani takes special precautions to safeguard the interests of out-landish Muslims we give an extract from the Maulana's notorious speech at Shrihatt as published by 'Anand-Bazar-Patrika':—

"The British power is gradually waning. They will soon have to bid good-bye to India. Therefore, I maintain that if we do not wage a fight against the Hindus and enfeeble them, they will not only establish Hindu Raj in India but also dominate the entire Islamic World. But it is within the power of Muslims to enfeeble India or to make it strong. It is therefore the duty of every faithful Muslim to join the Muslim League and carry on a struggle with the Hindus for two things, viz. firstly, to enfeeble the Hindus, in order to prevent them from establishing their domination in India and secondly, to found Muslim Raj in the country, should the British leave the shores of India. Although the British are the enemies of Mussalmans, the moment of Anglo-Muslim war is yet far off. After a provisional agreement with the Hindus through the Muslim League, it would be easy enough to expel the British from India and to found a Muslim Raj here."

We learn from the autobiography of Pandit Jawaharlal that Lala Lajpat Rai knew of the conspiracies carried on with foreign Muslims by the leaders of Congress and Khilafat, through the agency of Maulavi Obeidulla. Says Jawaharlal,

"Lalaji accused the Congress leaders of intriguing with people outside India. He may have relied on various rumours and I think he must have been influenced by the talk he had recently with Maulavi Obeidulla, although there was nothing in that talk which seemed extraordinary to me."

Since the Maulavi had taken an active part in these conspiracies it is not surprising that Lalaji believed in him. We must explain why the Muslim conspirators informed the Hindu leaders of their conspiracies. The Mussalmans are fully cognisant of the fact that unless they secure the support of the Hindus the combined strength of Indian and foreign Muslims would be powerless by itself to wrest India

from the clutches of the British. Therefore, they always endeavour to ensnare the Hindu leaders in their fold by taking advantage of the latter's hatred for Britain. In this way the Hindu leaders get some information of these treasonable activities.

A few days ago a Professor of History made an admission to us that he was convinced of the high treason of Gandhiji but what led Gandhiji to become a traitor was a riddle to the learned Professor. We were requested to explain the phenomenon. We proceed to elucidate the problem briefly. The institution of nation is solely designed for the purpose of protecting people belonging to a common nationality from the aggression of external foes. The Mahatmas, who propound the theory of non-resistance to the aggression of foreign enemies under any circumstance, are necessarily hostile to the institution of Nation. Gandhiji had published in 'Harijan' an article advising the British people not to offer any resistance to Germany. From the perusal of that article, thoughtful people may get an adequate idea of the infernal depths to which this philosophy of non-resistance is capable of leading men to. Other nations get an inspiration from the heroic example of a nation like Greece courageously facing the deadly enemy. Instead of looking at the present world-war from this point of view, Gandhiji is trying to cause a split amongst the intellectuals of the country for which he professes to have deep sympathy. His duplicity and inconsistency in this matter rouse nothing but scorn in our mind. Let us probe a little into the fundamental cause of this inconsistency between Gandhiji's sentiments and actions. He is stone-blind to the fact that the virtues of the family-life often prove to be vices in the sphere of politics. This very blindness on his part leads him to advise the Hindus, in and out of season, to consider the

Muslims as their younger brothers and act generously towards them. The evil consequences, issuing out of attaching greater importance to fraternal affection than to wholesome maxims of political science, are wellknown to any student studying the career of the Emperor Humayun. It is no use expatiating on this when we know how Gandhiji hates schools and bookish knowledge. The love cherished by Muslim brothers who are so near to Gandhiji's heart towards their Hindu brethren is so celestial that it would have offered some model lessons even to Aurangzeb. On this question of brotherly love it is expedient to draw the attention of our Gandhiite and Marxist friends to a notorious passage from the Muslim 'Outlook' the mouthpiece of Sir Fazali Hussain, sometime Executive Councillor of the Government of India. A resolution on the national demand was passed in September 1925, as a result of the co-operation between Pandit Motilal Nehru and Mr. Jinnah. The Editor of 'Muslim Outlook' thus commented on the event,

"We approved of the demand put forward in the Legislative Assembly because when the British surrender power to the Indians, the Muslims will naturally appropriate that power if necessary with the aid of the Afghans. While we believe that much Tanzim work remains to be done before even the Muslims can honestly declare that they really desire freedom or deserve it, we also recognize that nothing is so educative as war and after a healthy battle with the Hindus both communities will improve, that is, if any Hindus should survive the battle. The Gokulehand Narang School of politicians knows just as well as we do, that Swaraja will be either Hindu Raj or Muslim Raj and their Sanghatan activities are nothing but preparations for the war which must ensue. Our own anticipation is that the British will lose India as a result of the approaching world-war; because that war will be upon us, before the Muslims of India are strong enough to prevent it or at least to preserve India's neutrality. Muslim Raj will automatically ensue, because the masters of India then will in all likelihood be the Afghans. But if the Hindus are in a hurry for the inevitable to occur, if they will not wait for the next world-war to end British

domination in India, but prefer to coax the British to surrender power immediately we see no harm in humouring them in their haste. In other words we have no objection to using the Hindu politicians as tools and at the same time telling them the truth, viz. that it is Muslim rule in India to which we look forward and the next time Muslims rule India, we trust, they will continue the good work begun by Sultan Mahamud of Ghazni and Aurangzeb."

On reading the above passage our Gandhiite friends will argue that the policy of Muslim Congressmen is diametrically opposed to the one indicated in the passage. With a view to shattering the illusion entertained by our ostrich-like friends, provided they care to listen to us, we quote below an extract from the 'People' dated 18-10-1925, which clearly reveals the degree of divergence existing between the policy of the 'Muslim Outlook' and the views of a prominent Congress Muslim, Dr. Kitchlew :—

"The Muslim Outlook of Lahore (Sir Fazal-i-Hussain's paper) and the Tanzeem of Amritsar (Dr. Kitchlew's paper) are engaged in a fierce controversy over the question whether the British Raj will be followed by Muslim Raj or Islamic Raj. The former is frankly of opinion that the British will either voluntarily surrender to the Muslims the rule of India or the latter with the aid of the Afghans will win it by the sword, after the British have left India. The Tanzeem says that although a Muslim Raj is their ideal, the circumstances of India being peculiar, an Islamic Raj with the Hindus participating in it will do. The 'Outlook' retorts that there can be no Islamic Raj in which non-Muslims can participate because the latter cannot be expected to act Islamically."

The difference between the views boils down to this: The Muslim Congressman wants an Islamic Raj in which Hindus would be 'hewers of wood and drawers of water.' That is what is exactly contemplated by the 'Hindu-participation.' The other younger brother (Sir Fazal-i-Hussain) is more frank, he advocates pure Muslim rule under which all vestiges of Hindu culture are to be mercilessly erased

and wiped out. Thus there is no fundamental difference between the two concepts. There is only a difference of degree. Every Hindu should engrave this terrible truth upon his heart and should start in right earnest to consolidate his strength if he wishes to escape the fate, outlined in the passage of the 'Muslim Outlook.' A similar objection was raised by a correspondent of 'The London Times' during a conversation with Shaukat Ali in the presence of Gandhiji in 1921.

"I turned to Mr. Shaukat Ali and asked him whether according to Mahomedan doctrine, at least in the extreme form in which the champions of Khilafat professedly hold it, the world is not divided into two parts, the Dar-ul-Islam, or world of Islam under Mahomedan rule and the Dar-ul-Harb, or world of war in which infidels may rule for the time being but only till the hour has struck for the sword of Islam to subdue them. To which of these two worlds would India belong when she has attained to Swaraja. Mr. Shaukat Ali evaded the question by indignantly repudiating the notion that under Swaraja Hindus would ever do any wrong to Islam, but he admitted that if they did, the Mahomedans who could never renounce their belief in the sword—and it was because Turkey was the sword of Islam that they could not see her perish or the Khilafat depart from her—would know how to redress their wrongs."

The passage clearly reveals what thin partition divided the non-violent attitude of Gandhiji's brother (Shaukat Ali) from his violent attitude. The internal disputes in a country are usually resolved by constitutional methods. The necessity for armed strife arises only when they cannot be so adjusted. Instead of indicating this normal solution, Shaukat Ali at once talks of an armed conflict. It may therefore be deduced that the extremists among the Muslims had already made up their minds to look upon India, a preponderantly Hindu nation, as a world of war (Dar-ul-Harb). Last year, when the Congress Ministries in eight provinces resigned their offices, Mr. Jinnah issued a Fatwa to the Indian Muslims



to the effect, that they should observe a special day as a day of deliverance. The Congress Ministries were predominantly Hindu in personel. Their fall from the posts of power was considered by Jinnah as an indirect victory for Islam. The struggle has already commenced although the British are still ruling over the land.

Among Muslim Royal dynasties it was a tradition for the in-coming emperor either to behead or imprison his brothers before he ascended the throne. The Muslim leaders make no secret of their desire to follow the same tradition in case of their Hindu brothers. The passages from Muslim papers testify to it. Gandhiji is impotent to safeguard the Hindu community from this danger. His philosophy of non-violence forbids him, from raising even his little finger. The utmost that he can do is to observe a fast for 21 days in memory of the defunct Hindu culture,—with the disappearance of Hindus in a 'healthy war' their culture will also die—and also to purify his Muslim brothers by vicarious penance. Besides, his intimate contact with the Muslims has almost converted him to Islam. Our statement bears a ready proof. We place before our readers Gandhiji's own words (Vide 'Young India,' 23-10-1924). The issue contains a dialogue between Gandhiji and Shaukat Ali. In the course of the conversation Gandhiji says, "I am speaking to you as though I was a Mussalman, because I have cultivated that respect for Islam which you have for it."

Many followers of Gandhiji get offended when their opponents make a charge against Gandhiji and his Congress, that they always give preferential treatment to Muslims at the expense of Hindus who form the backbone of the nation. Those followers should ponder over the above words of their Guru. When Gandhiji's mentality is cent per cent

favourable to Islam, it is no wonder that his worthy disciples, who are only born Hindus but are ashamed to own Hindu culture, carry on activities, under the auspices of the Congress, which are detrimental to their own religion. As an illustration of this type of propaganda we give below an extract from the History of the Congress published by Maharashtra Congress Committee, with a foreward by Mr. Shankarrao Deo.

“When India will attain Swaraj, she guarantees the independent Muslim nations that she would so formulate her policy as to be in full accord with the tenets of Muslim religion. (Note—This goes to prove that the Gandhiite Hindus are not incapable of acting Islamically.) The members of the Working Committee were of this opinion. So long as Indians have not thought over this question and so long as the A. I. C. C. has not passed a resolution to that effect, it was the desire of the Working Committee that the resolution should not be announced to the public as issuing from the A. I. C. C.” (Page 257.)

Hindus cannot afford to forget that the mentality underlying the declaration made by Mr. Rajgopalachari, a few days ago to the effect that if the Viceroy nominates a member of the Muslim League as India's Prime Minister, and forms a national ministry under his leadership, it will have our full support, is identical with the resolution of the Congress Working Committee.

So far we have considered the danger to the Hindu Community arising from the activities of Muslim Leaders who have faith in the cult of the Sword. We should, however, not be misled by the false idea that we are any the more safe from the Muslim-Gandhis who pretend to have greater faith in non-violence than that possessed even by Gandhiji himself. During the session of the A. I. C. C., in Poona, it was resolved that Independent India required a national army for safeguarding internal tranquillity and

warding off external aggression. Of the two Gandhis, Abdul Ghaffar Khan, masquerading under the title of Frontier Gandhi, offered more resistance to this resolution than Gandhiji himself. The following information appeared in the issue of 'Free Press Journal' dated 13-9-1940, "Gandhiji is not free to decide for himself. Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan has taken the same stand as Gandhiji in the recent controversy and it will not be possible for the two to take differing views. So far as can be ascertained, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan stands up by his convictions that there is no place for him in the Congress, unless the Congress reverses the Wardha declaration on the need of an army and rescinds the Poona offer based on the belief in the ethics of armed resistance."

What a miracle! Frontier Gandhi threatens to resign from the Congress if that body does not give up its resolution relating to the need of a national army. The Ultra-Gandhi addresses Gandhiji thus: We jointly opposed the resolution, therefore, it would be unjust to me if you modify your attitude about it, leaving me in the lurch. This comradeship is fatal, it works only to the advantage of Muslims. The crafty Muslim leader has not an iota of love for the Congress or Gandhiji but he will continue to embrace them (Gandhiji and the Congress) with profound affection only so long as he can, with their aid accomplish the nefarious design of devitalising the Hindus through the policy of non-violence and turn them into the enemies of their motherland, serving thereby the interests of his predatory brotherhood, living across the Frontier.

Being disgusted with this circumstance, it is not surprising that a patriot like Shrinivas Iyengar, an ex-President of the Congress, should give vent to the utterance: "Non-violence means treason to one's nation."

It seems from the foregoing extract from the 'Free Press Journal' that Frontier Gandhi was obstinate about the Congress withdrawing its resolution passed at Poona, offering help to Government on certain conditions. A doubt was expressed in the extract taken from the 'Muslim Outlook' about the possibility of Indian Muslims maintaining neutrality of India in the world-war to come. Even today the Muslim followers of Mr. Jinnah are not prepared to help the Government in their war effort. There appears to be some deep-laid and consistent plot behind all these events. In this connection we point out to the reader an extremely important statement from an article penned by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. At present he is the President of the Congress. He says:—

“There are only four circumstances under which India can be attacked from outside. Firstly, the present circumstance, under which the British Government is ruling over us against our will and holding us as slaves. In this case any attack directed against India will not be against the country and ourselves, but against the British Government and as that Government has established its rule over the Islamic countries, and is fighting against the Khilafat, no Muslim under any Islamic law has any obligation to side with it.” (1-6-1921.)

Maulana Azad means that in that circumstance he cannot even remain neutral and help the Government even passively. From this statement the riddle, why the Congress in spite of Gandhiji's opposition, forwarded a resolution to the Government demanding the acceptance of its claims as a condition of its co-operation and why constitutional rule was made impossible by calling out Congress ministries, is solved. The question whether the people of India should or should not lend their support to the Government in the event of a foreign invasion, has assumed as much importance in these days as it had in 1921. The Indian situation is more precarious now than during the period of the non-co-operation

movement. Taking a broad view of the future of India Lala Lajpat Rai made the following statement as early as the year 1921 in the issue of 'Vande Mataram' (1-6-1921).

"If ever the British Government were so weakened, that some other foreign power were to overpower it Hindus would have to think what to do, because they would not like to see India under any foreign power or nation."

The reader must have noticed from the foregoing extracts that the Muslims have already thought over all the future problems confronting them and taken definite decisions. So far as our knowledge goes we are not aware of any decision arrived at by Hindu leaders on these issues. We therefore humbly beseech that it is now high time for them to wake up and to reflect on these matters and arrive at a sound decision.

We have sufficiently brought home to the reader how the politics of the Gandhi group hangs upon the selfish plans of certain Muslim leaders. It is a parasitic growth sucking the life sap of the Hindu nation. We now proceed to argue out the charge of communalism likely to be levelled against us by our Marxist and Gandhiite friends. According to the philosophy of both these schools the time has arrived for the foundation of a united India on the principles of democracy. Every nation has its own geographical boundries. Those alone deserve the right to be the citizens and leaders of the nation who are ever ready to sacrifice their homes and hearths to protect the boundries of the nation. On the contrary those who encourage the trans-frontier armies to encroach upon their own country are condemned as traitors, to whatever sect they may belong, by the whole world. Our view will be readily acceptable to a Turk or Persian; but our friends in India who are out to establish national unity and democracy, seem to have forgotten the very fundamentals of nationalism. No tragedy can be more excruciating.

## THE AFGHAN MENACE

[This important article was specially written for the 'Leader' by some responsible Moderate leader who had been invited to attend the private Khilafat Conference, held at Allahabad, before the beginning of the Non-co-operation movement. Sir Tej Behadur Sapru may be able to throw some light on the authorship of this article.]

The Afghan menace has brought to the fore the question of the attitude of Indian Mussalmans towards the Afghans in the event of an Afghan invasion, and Mr. Mohamed Ali has defined the Muslim attitude quite clearly, not—be it noted for the first time. He, his brother and a number of other Muslims have previously given expression to the same view but mostly in private conferences and committees. The last Madras speech, I trust, is the first, public enunciation of the Muslim attitude from a platform and should undoubtedly attract the attention that it deserves. Close readers of the Urdu press, however, who have been following the attitude of the Muslim press towards the Afghan question would feel not a bit of surprise at this speech of Mr. Mohamed Ali, unlike, 'Middle Course' whose letter under the heading 'The Responsibility of N. C. Os, appeared in Saturday's 'Leader.' Long before the Afghan Mission arrived at Mussooree and particularly after its arrival the advanced section of the Muslim press assumed an attitude towards the Mission, which could not be fully covered by the adjective 'friendly.' Appeals were made to the Mission to see that the Turkish question was placed in the forefront of the negotiations and that they should not be concluded unless it was settled to the satisfaction of Indian Mussalmans. There also appeared verses in praise of the Mission and its members

who, it seemed to me, were being almost welcomed as deliverers. Let me quote one of the two couplets that appeared below the portrait of the head of the Mission, Mahmud Beg Tarzi, in a Lahore daily :

आशियाका पेरहन युरोपके हाथों फट गया ।

(?) करनेके लिये काबूलसे दर्जी आगये ॥

(Asia's garment has been torn at the hands of Europe. Tailors from Kabul have come to stitch it. )

I have forgotten the first couplet which ends as महमूद तार्जी आगये। The Mission stayed at Mussooree for long, and that it was closely following events in this country was apparent from the communications from the Mission which appeared in the Urdu press, and, *if I remember rightly, at least in one English daily.* (The Independent of Nehru.) All that was thus possible to work up a pro-Afghan sentiment was done. Speeches of the Amir of Afghanistan were widely reproduced and much was made of the references they contained about the cause of the Khilafat and the part taken by the Hindus in it. Hindus were also told to appreciate the fifteen or sixteen concessions made by the Amir by way of abolition of religious discriminations and so on.

Under these circumstances if the Mission took heart from the attitude of the Muslim press, which may or may not represent the vast bulk of Muslim opinion, but which certainly does not represent the vast bulk of Indian opinion and pitched their demands too high to be conceded, where is the inherent impossibility which causes men like 'The Middle Course' not to be convinced of these factors tending to complicate the situation? Official archives are not open to the public and under these circumstances absolute conviction is not possible. As for the Leader's remark about the resolutions of Nagpur having been allowed to travel

as far as Kabul and there being responsible for complicating the situation there is nothing improbable, in it either. I have read certain speeches of the Amir as reproduced in the Urdu press, as also the reprints from some Afghan journals which do show that reports of the Ali Brothers' exploits did travel from India to Kabul long before even the Muhajirin movement was inaugurated and it is not only probable but certain that not only the Nagpur resolutions but certain speeches also have reached Kabul, if anything, in an exaggerated form. All this has, however, only an indirect bearing on the question. *But the Muslim League at its Nagpur Session passed a resolution bearing directly on the question. They requested the Amir of Afghanistan to reject the treaty with the Great Britain as India has no quarrel with Afghanistan and as such treaties were meant to strengthen the hold on India. This resolution, it must be remembered, was passed on the eve of the British Mission leaving for Kabul ( the Mission left on Jan. 4, 1921 ) and must have been communicated to the Afghan agent at Peshawar, possibly with the speeches in support of it.* It will thus be seen that the responsibility for the protraction of the negotiations is probably to be laid at least at the door of our Muslim N. C. Os, if not all N. C. Os, and to this extent they are responsible for the increased military cost.

It is of no consequence to them that India may be bled white with increased taxation but friendly relations must never be established between India and Afghanistan, because forsooth the British Government at Home has been responsible for depriving the Khalifa of some of his dominions. Let them, if they please, ask Kemal Pasha or A or B or Z to redress the Khalifat wrong and punish the British Government in England or elsewhere as much as he can for the infliction of this wrong on Islam, but let them not, if they are genuine Nationalists, consent to the violation of the Indian frontier on the North-West. It has been pertinently



asked as to how our Muslim co-religionists will distinguish in practice between an invasion for the purpose of conquering India and one for the purpose of punishing the British Government. Besides, where is the guarantee that an invasion for the purpose of punishing the British Government may not ultimately turn out to be one in practice if not in theory for the purpose of conquering India and acquiring dominion over it? I need not mention here how the British flag has followed British trade, not to speak of other instances in history, and is it anything short of madness to run the risk of Afghan domination following the punishment of the British Government for the Turkish wrong? I may here remind the reader how the Allies were very persistently declaring ever since the outbreak of the war that they had no quarrel with the people of Germany, but only with the warlords of Germany, the militarists. Many of the warlords have now gone to the grave, others are on their way to it and in exile, but what is now the practical difference between a war with the people of Germany and a war with the militarists? Who is it that will pay the reparation money and whose economic existence is now proposed to be mortgaged for a period of 42 years under the Paris Agreement on reparations? Let nobody therefore be under the delusion that punishment of the British Government may not in practice also mean our own punishment and let every Indian beware that in the attempt to get rid of a 'Satan' and in the look-out for an angel in his place, we may not really catch a Tartar. Further, everybody knows the indescribable plight of the Hindus in the North-West Frontier province while the protecting arm of the Government is still there. Need anybody be told what their condition, as also of the Hindus of the Punjab, will be with an Afghan invading army on Indian soil? It will be said that the present raids are the work of the

barbarous border tribes with which the Amir has nothing to do. *Either the Amir is in a position to control them or he is not. If he is, why cannot he prevent these inhuman raids on the Hindu population of the Frontier province in gratitude for the part played by the Hindus in the Khilafat cause. But if he is unable to control them, then it is certain that an invasion will most certainly give the tribes the opportunity that they desire and the Hindus need expect no mercy at their hands, the Ali Brothers notwithstanding. What have the Ali Brothers done up-till now to help the Hindu population on the Frontier that we may rely upon their promises for the future? They have passed a resolution advising the Amir to reject the treaty but not one requesting him to use his influence and power with the tribes to stop these raids. Need I dwell upon the significance of these omissions?* Further assuming that the brothers mean to abide by their word and act as they say in a certain situation, where is the guarantee that the view of these stalwart Nationlists will then be the view of the entire Indian Muslim community and that their assistance will in either case be really effective? *Some of these points were put much more forcefully by the Hon. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and Lala Lajapat Rai at the private Khilafat Conference convened at Allahabad to which Mrs. Beasant and Some Moderates were also invited in the summer of 1920. I do not know what the view of these gentlemen now is, but at this Conference they did openly declare that the Hindus could not reconcile themselves to the Muslim attitude on this question.* It was after this Conference that the Central Khilafat Committee adopted the programme which with some modification, was adopted at Calcutta and that the ultimatum was given that on and after August 1st Indian Mussalmans ceased to be subjects of the King-Emperor. This virtually amounted to a declaration of war and the stress on the Hijrat movement meant that India under Britain was virtually an enemy country for a scrupulous Mussalman and the friendly Islamic state of Afghanistan alone could accommodate him. Even the failure of this movement did not open the

eyes of our friends not to treat with foreign states but confine themselves to this country alone for the redress of their wrongs, whatever their nature, but this apparently is not to be. I cannot for a moment imagine that in spite of all the grievances that Labour in England has against the present Coalition Government, it would for that reason welcome and invite a German invasion, if only for the purpose of merely punishing the present Coalition Government. But the nationalism of our friends can welcome a foreign invasion of India and run the risk of exchanging fire for the frying pan, in order to punish England for the wrongs done by her to Turkey.

But what of India being punished side by side with England? Will that aspect of the question engage the attention of our countrymen? *Curiously enough, when it comes to the question of achieving Swaraj, all foreign aid and foreign propaganda is shunned.* The British Congress Committee must be dissolved, no propaganda need be carried on anywhere on the face of the earth. All effort must be centred in this country. *But when it comes to the redress of the wrong to Turkey, not only is all assistance from China to Peru invited but even an Indian invasion is virtually solicited.* It is time that the Hindus at least seriously pondered over this question. So far as the employment of Indian troops abroad is concerned they have exerted all their influence against their being used and will continue to do so, and with the Indian legislature's increasing powers, we can confidently expect that they will not any more be used in future at least in Mesopotamia, Palestine, Persia or Egypt. But will they consent to the invasion of Indian soil, for whatever purpose it may be said to be planned? Let them cast their eyes a few centuries backward and declare themselves soon before much mischief may be done. I for one

would prefer to continue to wear torn and tattered clothes, rather than send for Afghan tailors to stitch them.

Let it not be forgotten that the exaggerated reports of the Punjab disturbances immediately precipitated the last Afghan invasion and let us beware of any fresh disturbances in the country giving the vigilant foe at the gate his longed for opportunity. Mr. Zafar Ali Khan assured the Hindus at the Khilafat Conference mentioned above on the basis of a talk which he said he had with a relative of the Amir, perhaps a cousin, in a railway train that the Afghans had no designs on India or the Hindus. We may be pardoned if we are a little sceptical about the assurances and prefer to be guided by the practical experience of the Calcutta Marwari and the frontier Hindu, as also the lessons of history.

## AFGHANS & PARTITION OF INDIA

### I

During his youth Mr. Jinnah played a leading role in the Congress ranks as the political heir-apparent of the late Parsi patriot—Sir Pherojshah Metha, and now in his closing years he has surprised everybody by his new discovery that India is not a nation, but a sub-continent. During the 3rd week of Jan. 1940, Mr. Gandhi, had mentioned him as a patriot. Denying the charge levelled against him of being a patriot, Mr. Jinnah emphatically declares as follows :

“Let me say again that India is not a nation, nor a country. It is a sub-continent composed of Nationalities, —Hindus and Muslims being the two major nations.”

The most striking sentence of Mr. Jinnah which no nationalist Hindu heart should ever forget is this : ‘India is not a nation, nor a country.’ That culturally Muslims feel themselves to be strangers to this land is quite a notorious fact. And now Mr. Jinnah has shattered all hopes of the Congress leaders, as regards their geographical patriotism.

It is really unfortunate to see that in spite of the stern and cutting replies from Mr. Jinnah, Mr. Gandhi is still hugging his illusions. He writes again on 27th Jan. 1940, in his ‘Harijan.’

“Qaide Azam Jinnah’s reply to me, as published in the press, however, dashes to the ground all hope of unity, if he represents the Muslim mind. His picture of India as a continent containing nations counted according to their

religions, if it is realised, would undo the effort the Congress has been making over half a century. But I hope that Qaide Azam Jinnah's opinion is a temporary phase in the history of the Muslim League. "

Such sentences from Mr. Gandhi clearly demonstrate how his self-deception over-rides his love for truth. At least this much is admitted in the above sentence that Mr. Jinnah represents the opinion of the Muslim League, but before closing his article this so-called Mahatma takes a somersault and once more expresses his hope that "Qaide Azam Jinnah does not represent the considered opinion of his colleagues. "

This statement from Mr. Gandhi reminds us of the famous Sanskrit proverb which says that—"Those who are the slaves of hope, are the slaves of everybody on this earth. "

To expect that the rabid Communalist colleagues of Mr. Jinnah can be more considerate, is but a false hope. The officers of the Government often declare that the term 'Nationalist Muslims' is an example of a contradiction in terms.

The only exceptions to the above statement can be the radical Muslims who have discarded the principles of nationalism and religion, owing to their greater faith in Moscow than in Mecca. But they can hardly be called Nationalist Muslims. Therefore, the writer of this article feels justified in saying that the remarks of the English officers are true to the letter. And for that reason the present writer had openly questioned the pretensions of Dr. Ansari in a public meeting at Poona. Pandit Nehru's opinion does not differ much from our own, as regards the Nationalist Muslims. We find it neatly expressed in one of his statements issued to the press on 1-5-37 which is as follows :

"Some people suggest that semi-communal nationalist parties should be formed like a Muslim-Congress party. That seems to me a wrong course which will encourage communalism and injure the larger cause. Our experience of the Nationalist Muslim Party was not a happy one."

The Pandit must have been quite aware of the way in which Ansari and other Nationalist Muslims conspired with Aga Khan to cheat the Congress.

And probably the above expressions of the Pandit are due to remorse caused by the knowledge of that conspiracy. In spite of such adverse experience from the nationalist Muslim quarters, it is surprising to see how Mr. Gandhi still hopes for a true spirit of nationalism, from those communalist Muslim leaders who are but the trusted lieutenants of Mr. Jinnah.

Further in his article of the 27th January, we see his misguided statements:—

"Both Muslims and Christians are converts from Hinduism or are descendants of converts. They do not cease to belong to their provinces because of change of faith. Englishmen who become converts to Islam do not change their nationality."

Here Mr. Gandhi has compared the change of province of the converts of Hindusthan with the change of nationality of the English converts. We suspect that this change of words is intentional. For only a few days back, he had advised the Hindus of Sind to migrate. For the present let us see what is implied in Mr. Gandhi's statement that there is no reason why any change of religion should influence a person's love of his country.

From the material point of view, religion, society and nations are the creations of man for self-preservation. And

hence the question whether conversion reacts on nationalism must be considered from the standpoint of self-preservation. In his book on "The two Sources of Morality and Religion." M. Bergson, the noted French philosopher says:—

"Who can help seeing that social cohesion is largely due to the necessity for a community to protect itself against others, and that it is primarily as against all other men that we love the men with whom we live?"

From this point of view, it will be observed, that Englishmen fortunately have the nation and national spirit as the mainstay of their self-preservation. Hence, if any person changes his religion in England at his whim, they care but little for the change. This state of things has not existed before and nobody except perhaps the Marxists feel sure that it will continue hereafter.

Conditions in England differ vastly from those in India. Never was England invaded by Mahomedans, while during the last thousand years, Hindusthan has been subjected to Muslim invasions, which can be counted by hundreds.

Under such conditions, if a Hindu changes his religion for Islam, his position from the point of self-preservation is at once altered. And this is quite natural. The individual who has so far looked to the Hindu society as the very means of his self-preservation, now when he has changed his colours for Islam looks upon his original Hindu society as an obstacle in the path of his progress. The newly converted Hindu, in addition to his hatred for Hindu society from the practical point of view, feels also a religious antagonism.

Converts are noted for the intensity of their hatred against their original religion. And Islam being a Monistic religion it inspires its adherents to hate the followers of other religions. All historians concur with this view. For example,



the famous historian of the present age, Dr. Toynbee in the fourth volume of his 'Study of History' says :—

"It is one of the keenest ironies of human history that the very illumination of human souls which has brought into Religion a perception of the unity of God and of the consequent brotherhood of Mankind should at the same time have made these souls prone to fall into the deadly sins of intolerance and persecution for Religion's sake."

After quoting Dr. Toynbee, there is no need, to adduce any further authority about the intolerance and persecution practised by monotheistic faiths. Both from the material as well as spiritual point of view, our enemies beyond the North-Western frontiers are doing their level best to see that the hatred of the Muslims in India for the Hindu society should develop into treachery and treason to the cause of Hindusthan. A certain Nawab has clearly stated in his valuable treatise on "The Indian Moslems," that—"In Kabul the designs on India have long found a natural incubator." No other word can more effectively describe the danger to India from the Kabul quarters. The Hindus should find out this anonymous Nawab, and publicly thank him for his valuable information. But Emperor Babar has said that "the people of Hindusthan are a strangely foolish and senseless race, possessed of little reflection and less foresight" and the Hindu race being of such a type the Nawabsahib must have dared to divulge this secret. Now let us see why Indian Muslims feel so much affinity for Afganistan. The same anonymous Nawab in explaining this point historically says :—

"Is there any reason to suppose that the descendants of the men who would not defend their homes against Babar and Akbar are today of better mettle? If Hinduism has no worthier representatives than the loud-voiced and quarrel-

some Bengalees then an unhesitating answer would have to be given in the negative. Of course, there are some Hindus such as the Sikhs and the Marathas, both minorities with whom the first Mogul conquerors never came in contact, that may be classed as of superior quality and entitled under every aspect to respect. And no doubt if India ever comes again to be subdivided, as was her usual lot before the Mogul arrived, they would be entitled to obtain their share in a general partition. But it would not be in any India that preserved its unity. In default of British control, resigned in weariness or disgust, that unity could only be revived and sustained by the Moslems recruited, as they would be, by their kinsmen and co-religionists, from the regions beyond the North-West Frontier."

We are at a loss to know, what further and clearer evidence of the Muslim ambition of ruling over India and of depending for this on the Afghan alliance is required for disillusioning our leaders who are pursuing wrong paths owing to their misconceptions?

But Mr. Gandhi has the incomparable, knack of conveniently neglecting, inconvenient things. Mr. Gandhi, who frowned on Mr. Jinnah for having equated Religion with Nationalism had nothing to say against, when similar sentiments were expressed by his so-called dear brother Maulana Mohamed Ali. We quote an example of this from the year 1921. In 1921 Dr. Lothrop Stoddard published his famous book "The world of Islam." In it is included a passage from the article 'Muslim Movement in India' by Mohamed Ali, which the latter had contributed to the French monthly, the 'Revue Politique Internationale' in 1914. The Maulanasahib says:—

"In the West, the whole science of government rests on the axiom that the essential divisions of humanity are determined by considerations of race and geography; but

for Orientals these ideas are very far from being axioms. For them humanity divides according to religious beliefs. The unity is no longer the nation or the state but the 'Millat' the organised group of followers of a particular religion. Europeans see in this a counterpart to their Middle Ages, a stage which Islam should pass through on its way to modernity in the Western sense. How badly they understand how religion looks to a Mahomedan! They forget that Islam is not only a religion but also a social organisation, a form of culture and a nationality. The principle of Islamic fraternity, of pan-Islamism if you prefer the word is analogous to patriotism, but with this difference that this Islamic fraternity, though resulting in identity of law and customs, has not (like Western Nationality) been brought about by community of race, country or history, but has been received, as we believe directly from God."

We do not see any practical difference between the long-winded discourse of Mohamed Ali and the brief and epigrammatic statement of Mr. Jinnah. So we believe that the same Gandhi who is now crossing swords with Mr. Jinnah will be on his knees again, the next day.



## II

Several people feel that Indian Muslims will at some stage give up their pan-Islamic attitude and unite with the Hindus on the basis of nationalism. But this hope is entirely baseless. The ideal of nationalism in the case of Muslims differs but little from the pan-Islamic ideal. For instance Dr. Lothrop Stoddard says :—

"In Moslem eyes, a man need not be born or formally naturalised to be a member of a certain Moslem 'Nationality.' Every Moslem is more or less at home in every part

of Islam, so a man may just happen into a particular country and thereby become at once, if he wishes, a national in good standing."

This means that a Mussalman although not born in India will on entering Hindusthan without loosing his rights of citizenship in the country of his origin, say that Hindusthan is his country and bully the Hindus who have no other home except Hindusthan. The finest example of this anomaly is Maulana Abul Kalam Azad himself, the present President of the Congress. Young Turk leaders, exported this Maulana from Turkey to India for the sake of such intrigues. That the Maulana was thereafter in secret correspondence with the Turkish Government has been admitted by himself to the celebrated French writer M. Maurice Pernot.

Learned Muslim writers are conscious of this pathetic dependence of Indian Muslims on the support of Muslims in foreign countries. The anonymous Nawab, whose words have been quoted before says : —

"The true cause of the decline and fall of Moguls was their cutting themselves apart from the races with a common origin. They became Indians but consequently they ceased to be Turks. A cleavage was effected with their kith and kin beyond the passes, and thus the recruited element which had made the armies of Babar and Humayun so formidable was eliminated."

This indicates that the Mogul Emperors failed because while ruling over India they had to depend more and more on Muslims in India, in place of Muslims from outside. In short, learned Muslims think that the Moguls should have regarded Hindusthan as their colony and not as their home. Dr. Clifford Manshardt, the American missionary in his volume on the 'Hindu Muslim problem in India' has

shown how under the Muslim regime Hindusthan was in the position of a colony. He writes :—

“ During the long period of Muslim domination in India there was constant intercourse between India and the Muslim world. Traders brought their articles for trade and exchange. Soldiers and adventurers were attracted by the love of excitement and the hope of gain. Religionists felt the call to proclaim their message. Governments needed qualified men to fill their positions of responsibility. Kings imported scholars, poets, skilled workmen and artists. Arabia, Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan and other nations sent their contingents to India—some to cast their lot with India and to remain, others to return to their own countries. This varied number of Muslim immigrants brought with them new ideas, the experience of other nations, new physical vitality and thus served as a stimulous to Indian Islam.”

It will be seen from this that the same deplorable state with regard to Indianisation of the services existed under the Muslim regime as it exists under British rule.

It may not be out of place to quote here a fresh instance of the insistant efforts of Indian Muslims to import foreign Muslims in India. Mr. Abdul Quaiyum, member for N.W.F. Province in the Central Assembly in a statement issued on 2nd February has recommended the employment in Indian Army, of the Pathan marauders beyond the frontier. This so-called nationalist Muslim writes :—

“ If twenty thousand tribesmen are serving in our army they will not only be a source of strength to us but we will have no danger of raids or kidnappings from their relations at home. Surely, they are better fighters than even the Gurkhas. I hope the Government of India will revise their policy regarding the tribes and a peaceful time will soon come.”

Our simple-minded Hindu leaders will not realise the pernicious intrigue that lies at the bottom of this outwardly innocent statement of the Muslim leaders. How can simple-minded people understand the elusive and enigmatic ways of statecraft. At the beginning of the present war Government of India asked for the aid of Gurkha soldiers from Nepal for the purpose of maintaining peace and order in India, and eight thousand Gurkha soldiers are said to be coming for India's aid. This has upset both the free-booters from the borders and their accomplices in India. The comparison of Pathans with the Gurkhas and the attempt to give the Gurkhas the secondary position, which we find in Mr. Quaiyum's statement are due to this feeling. The inclusion of the free-booters in our army means the gradual capture of the whole Empire by these free-booters ; but the Hindus may not realise this situation and even if they realise it, the Hindu leaders may not oppose these schemes, with a view to protect themselves from the immediate onslaught on their lives and property. And these expectations of the Muslim leaders are implied in the publication of the above statement.

Here it is necessary to clear the doubts of our Gandhian and Marxian friends. Their argument is " Since both Nepal and Afganistan are independent nations, are they not equally foreign to you ? If you feel affinity for Nepal, the Muslims also feel the same affinity for Afganistan. If you call the Muslim an anti-nationalist for his looking after the interest of Afghanistan, then why should not you also be called anti-nationalist for being particular about the interest of Nepal ? " People making such remarks, never try to learn the historical and geographical positions of both Nepal and Afghanistan. Hundreds of times, during the last thousand years, India had to suffer heavily from the Afghans. But, never even once, had India to suffer from Nepal. Generally

the Afghans are a warlike race. On the contrary, in Nepal, all people, excepting the Gurkha minority, are peace-loving. And even though Gurkhas are best warriors, they are not professional free-booters like the Afghans and the Pathans. The borders of India and Afghanistan are the permanent scenes of continual fights and outrages. While during the last hundred and twenty years, there was not a single quarrel on the borders of Nepal and India.

As compared to Afghanistan, Nepal is a very small country and its population is also much less. Even if Nepalees think of invading India they will not be able to secure help from anybody. Further their economic life being dependent on India, it is impossible for them to be inimical to India.

Here is a passage from Dr. Toynbee which deserves attention from all nationalist-minded people. It throws clear light on the problem of the inclusion in our army, of the wild tribes from beyond the Frontiers. While discussing how the Roman Emperors subdued such wild tribes, he says:—

“The more ambitious barbarian adventurers in the regular Imperial Service, who sought to make themselves the masters instead of the servants of the Imperial Government, were courageously crushed before their plans were ripe. But the Imperial authorities at Constantinople were not content simply to nip these attempts at barbarian usurpation in the bud as they threatened to unfold themselves. The statesmanship of Leo the Great cut the evil at the root by releasing the Empire from its perilous dependence upon barbarian mercenaries from a no-man’s land outside the Imperial frontiers. This breach with a vicious practice which had been growing upon the Empire for the past hundred years, was a moral triumph ; and Leo made it also a material success

by finding an alternative recruiting ground for the Imperial army in an enclave of recrudescing barbarism in the interior."

From this example, the readers will clearly understand how the power of the wild warrior tribes within the border should be properly marshalled against the invading wild tribes from outside the Frontiers. And for sound reasons we can take to task all those who say that both Gurkhas and Afghans are but strangers and foreigners to us.



### III

"The percentage of Muslims in the Indian army should be carried over 50 per cent and the frontier tribes should be taken in increasing numbers in the Indian army." This is a gist of the efforts, of the Muslim leaders, and these leaders have made a demand to the British Government that the Indian army should not be employed against the Muslim powers. In reply to this demand, H. E. the Viceroy stated as follows :—

"Finally you asked for an assurance that Indian troops will not be used outside India against any Muslim power or country. This question is fortunately hypothetical, since His Majesty is not at war with any Muslim power. You will appreciate, however, that is impossible to give a guarantee in terms so wide as those in your letter, which would have the effect of limiting India's right to use its own army in its own defence in circumstances which cannot now be foreseen. In the present situation, however, as you are aware every precaution has been taken by His Majesty's Government at the instance of the Government of India to ensure, that Muslim feeling in India on this matter is fully respected."



On reading this letter of the Viceroy every man with a nationalist mentality will be alarmed and disillusioned. Though the assurance given by the Viceroy is limited in its scope still the ignorant and fanatic Muslim soldiers will feel that henceforward Government will not dare to utilise them in fighting against the Muslim nations. Formerly, Bajirao the Second had recruited some Englishmen for his army on the condition that they will not be asked to fight against Englishmen and this force joined the enemy when Bajirao had to fight the English forces. In the case of Muslim forces similar result will ensue if the occasion arises.

The Congress-brand leaders have no idea as to how dangerous this attitude of the Muslim leaders will be to India. For instance, the editor of 'Free Press Journal' says in the issue of 8th February : " Jinnahsahib's letter to the Viceroy formulates no demand which is independent of or inconsistent with the Congress demand. "

We agree with this note of the editor of 'Free Press.' If the Indian Muslims will declare tomorrow that "We are subjects of the Turkish Government" the Gandhites will preach with conviction that the above statement of the Muslims is consistent with the Congress policy. Many will take this as a mere joke. This is however, no joke but a statement of fact.

In order to corroborate this, it is necessary to refer to historical events in 1921. In 1921, the Khilafat Conference was held along with the Congress Session at Ahmedabad. The Congress President, Hakim Ajmalkhan was also the president of the Khilafat Conference. It is a well-known fact that Hakim Ajmalkhan was an intimate friend of Mahatmaji. Hence all the activities of Hakim Ajmalkhan were going on with the consent of Gandhiji, and in saying

so we hope we would not be charged with censuring Gandhiji. The same Khilafat Conference under the presidentship of Hakim Ajmalkhan, had passed a resolution unanimously, of being loyal to the Sultan of Turkey. In the Government publication "India in 1921" by Rushbrook Williams, we find the following in appendix V on page 314 "A resolution of Allegiance to the Sultan of Turkey was passed, all standing." This year Abul Kalam Azad who has maintained frequent correspondence with the Turkish Government, is the Congress President. Being conscious of hundreds of such events of which the general public is completely ignorant, we feel obliged to oppose strongly the policy of both the Muslim League and the Congress. It can be proved from a quotation from the anonymous Nawab previously referred to in these articles that our opposition is actuated by national interest and not through communalism or Gandhi-phobia. The Nawab while criticising the Muslim demand about not using the Indian army against Muslim nations, remarks that the Muslims have forgotten their nationality through religious blindness. He says :—

"It so happened that among the Moslems there were some who had advocated an attitude of sympathy with Turkey even to the extent of refusing to sanction, the employment of our troops against her. In their aroused religious zeal and sympathy they forgot that they were British subjects and that they had a duty to perform as such that could not be repudiated even for the sake of a common religious cause. In national affairs it is not possible to serve two masters, if the supreme appeal happens to be made by both at the same moment."

In fact, these are the fundamental principles of national politics, and should never be forgotten by anybody. But now the Muslim leaders on account of the idea of pan-Islamism

and the Congress leaders on account of the idea of Universal Brotherhood have been led to shun real nationalism. The evil effects of this plight of nationalism have to be borne by Indians.

Historians are well aware of the way to teach nationalism to Muslim leaders and masses. We are stating the same remedy in the words of Toynbee who is a leading historian. The author has written in an article published in August 1938 on the question of protection of India from the military point of view, "If people with common race and common language live in close proximity and under different regimes they constantly try to bring about homogeneous Government, and this situation gives peace and tranquillity to none." Dr. Toynbee in his recent book, discusses this problem as follows :—

"In an age when the political creed of Nationalism was gaining ascendancy throughout the Western World, an identical problem of unusual difficulty presented itself to British Imperialism in South Africa and to Austrian Imperialism in South-Eastern Europe. In both regions the awakening of the local populations to national consciousness and to consequent political aspirations towards national unity and independence, found one local nationality partitioned between a great multi-national empire and two small and fragmentary and backward but at the same time independent national States ; and in both cases these States came to regard it as their mission to achieve the unity and independence of the whole of their own nation under their own flag, without being deterred by the consideration that the fulfilment of this national ambition on these lines would involve the disruption of the great multi-national empire which now held half their nationals as its more or less unwilling subjects. In both cases the threatened empire made a series of clumsy,

but on the whole well-meaning, efforts to safeguard its own integrity against its puny neighbours' preposterous designs without a breach of the peace or a change in the territorial status quo ; but in both cases the imperial statesmen rather reluctantly came to the conclusion after a time, that the existing partition of the recalcitrant nationality was not after all a possible basis for a permanent settlement, and that therefore, their only practical prospect of obtaining a solution that would be satisfactory to themselves lay in taking advantage of their overwhelming superiority in military strength in order to unite the recalcitrant nationality under the imperial flag, by putting a forcible end to their puny but aggressive neighbours' independence. "

Out of these while the English were successful and the Boers had to accept British rule, the Austrian experiment however failed and the Austrian empire collapsed. This is a well-known fact. The problem of the people of the same race cannot be solved, unless they are brought under one rule by all possible means.

At present, conditions on the North-West Frontier are the same as described by Dr. Toynbee in the above quotation. In order to take advantage of this situation the Muslims have started the Pakistan movement. The meaning of the word Pakistan is " a Nation of the followers of true religion." In fact, however, it is not derived from the word Pak. Mr. Rahamat Ali—the pioneer of the Pakistan movement—says:

" First, the Muslims had their homelands in Pakistan ; that is Punjab, North-West Frontier Province (also called Afghan Province), Kashmere, Sind and Baluchistan. The name Pakistan, I derived from the names of these five provinces. The Muslims have lived there as a nation for over twelve hundred years and possess a history, civilisation and

culture of their own. The area is separated from India proper (Hindusthan) by the Jamuna and it is not a part of India. Although twelve hundred years ago, there were Hindus and a Hindu Empire, since 712 for over a thousand years, they (Hindus) have been a minority community there. The total population of Pakistan is 42 millions of which 32 millions are Muslims. Their racial origins are from Central Asia." (Inside India ; page 352.)

From this confession it can be seen that the name Pakistan is formed from the initial letters of the provinces Punjab, Afghan, Kashmere, Sind and Baluchistan. When Rahamat Ali says that Afghanistan is included in Pakistan it fully reveals the danger of the Pakistan movement. According to the above mentioned principle of Dr. Toynbee, the Afghans in the Frontier Province will always be conspiring in favour of Afghanistan. The promoters of the Pakistan movement will always encourage such activities and hence the importance of including Afghanistan in Pakistan. Else, what was the necessity of mentioning the Pathans by the name, Afghans ? It is claimed that the Muslims in the above five provinces are living for the last 1200 years as one nation !

We have no time to discuss the invented history devised for the Pakistan movement. They fix the Jamuna river as the borderline of Pakistan and Hindusthan. This geographical invention requires further discussion. The borders of all nations are mostly settled by nature itself. If by misfortune a slave nation loses its natural borders, it tries to regain them when it becomes independent. This historical principle has been well proved by the history of Ireland and Italy. Under these circumstances no nationalist will give consent to the new demarcation of the borders of India penetrating the very heart of India itself ; because if the part of India on the North of Jamuna goes under foreign rule, it is impossible

to protect the remaining India from foreign invasion. Maharashtra is fully conscious of this fact, and this is why lakhs of Maratha soldiers laid down their lives at Panipat. With the same view Peshwas refused to enter into any compromises with Ahmad Shaha.

The very idea of the Muslim leaders that beyond Jamuna everywhere the majority of the population is Muslim is itself baseless. The proportion of Muslim population is not even 45 per cent in Jullundar, Ferozpur and Amritsar districts beyond Jamuna. The Muslim population is not even 30 per cent in Hissar, Rohatak, Gurgaon, Karnal, Ambala, Simla, Kangra, Hoshiarpur and Ludhiana districts. Even under these circumstances Muslim leaders insist upon including these districts in Pakistan. The real cause of this is that Pakistan cannot be an economic success as Sind, Frontier Province and Baluchistan are already bankrupt provinces. And if the Sikh and Hindu majority districts of the Punjab are excluded, even Punjab cannot remain an economic success. Then the rulers of Pakistan will have to follow the method of Mahamud of Gazni. If it is expected that such things will not take place in the near future, nobody should be under any delusions, and for this they should keenly study the last ten years' history of Muslim outrages in Kashmere and Sind.

#### IV

Mr. Rahamatali's scheme of Pakistan is defective in one important particular. According to him the population of Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan, Frontier Province and Kashmere, is four and quarter crores and Hindus are one crore among them. These figures are however wrong. This can be shown by a little calculation. The population of Punjab is 235 lakhs and out of them 133 lakhs are Mussalmans. The

population of Sind is 39 lakhs and the Mussalmans number 28½ lakhs. In Baluchistan, in the population of 4½ lakhs, Mussalmans number 4 lakhs. Out of 36 lakhs population in Kashmere nearly 28 lakhs are Muslims. In the Frontier there are 22 lakhs of Muslims in a population of 23½. All these provinces included in the Pakistan scheme make up a total population of 3 crores and 38 lakhs, of whom only 215 lakhs are Mussalmans. So if the Pakistan scheme materialises only these 215 lakhs will be satisfied, but the question of remaining 6 crores of Muslims in other parts of Hindusthan remains unsolved. In order to solve this difficulty at least six other schemes of Pakistan have been devised by Muslim leaders. The first part of the Indian Annual Register for 1939 mentions the following schemes :

‘The Islamic Culture of Hyderabad’ (Deccan), a quarterly journal published under the auspices of the thought-leaders of the Nizam State headed by Sir Akbar Hyderi, in its ‘Cultural Activities’ section in a recent issue speaks of seven schemes outlined by Muslim thinkers and public men. These are : Sir Shikander Hayat’s scheme, the Pakistan Plan, the Quinquupartite scheme of the Nawab of Mamot, the Pakistan Khilafat, Dr. Latiff’s Cultural Future of India, the scheme of Muslim Federation and the Eastern Afghanistan scheme.”

Out of these schemes Syed Abdul Latiff’s scheme is of special importance. Because the Muslim League had appointed a special committee to consider this scheme. The Committee included Mr. Jinnah, Sir Shikandar Hayat Khan and several other Muslim leaders. When eminent Muslim leaders are seriously considering such schemes, we really wonder how learned Hindus still think that the plan of partitioning Hindusthan is merely a dream. Dr. Toynbee has sounded the warning to scholars in Hindusthan in the following words :

"In the same sober spirit an Indian of the present generation might speculate on the future role in India's destinies, of those barbarians—entrenched in a warlike independence in their fastnesses beyond the limits of the Government of India's administrative control—from among whom no less than one-seventh of the Indian Regular Army was recruited in A. D. 1930. Were the Gurkha mercenaries and the Pathan raiders of that day marked out to be remembered in history as the fathers or grand-fathers of barbarian conquerors who were to carve out on the planes of Hindusthan the successor States of the British Raj?"

When the expansion of an empire is stopped the adjoining barbarian tribes beyond its Frontier develop their strength during the continuous clashes with the empire. This historical rule about the fall of empires has been enunciated by Dr. Toynbee as follows :

"This stationary warfare along a sharply drawn line is not a stable or permanent equilibrium, but is a temporary and precarious balance which invariably ends in a barbarian breakthrough. Because in this situation, time works inexorably on the barbarians' side."

As the wars on the Frontier are prolonged, the barbarians naturally become more and more advanced in the science of war. On the other hand, owing to the policy of the empire to recruit mainly, men on the frontier and beyond in its army, the inner parts of the empire itself lose their fighting qualities. In the end, the soldiers on the frontier instead of fighting the trans-frontier raiders think that their interest lies in looting their own countrymen. When this change takes place in the mentality of the fighters on the frontier, the empire itself perishes owing to its own folly.

Congress leaders in their simplicity and Muslim leaders



with deep design concur in saying that the Imperial Government should make friends with the Frontier barbarians. But the inborn nature of these tribes is such that no Government with self-respect can make friends with them. Commenting on the nature of such tribes Sir Arthur Keith, the wellknown anthropologist says :

“Tribal life is possible only if man can hate as well as love. Every member of a tribe must have a double nature: one to be exercised on his tribesmen; the other to be exercised on all who are outside the tribe. In every breast there is the power to hate as well as to love, to be cruel as well as to be kind, to help as well as to hinder, to save as well as to kill. A tribesman has no option. One side of his nature prevailed within the tribe; the other without it.”

Considering the nature of the tribes it is impossible to make them friendly. This means in other words that the borders of one particular civilisation must extend to the borders of other civilisations or nations. If the borders of two nations come close together wars between the two nations are waged, generally with regard to the demarkation of this border line. The history of the wars between France and Germany will corroborate this proposition. If a barbarian type of civilisation is situated on the border of a particular nation, that nation has to conquer the barbarian territory. Otherwise the nation and its civilisation fall a prey to the barbarians. The truth of this proposition will also be amplified by a review of the history of the relations of Hindusthan with Afghanistan. It will be seen from this history that either Afghanistan was under the rule of Hindusthan or *vice versa*. Considering this experience, it is hoped that Hindu leaders who have eyes to see will realise the necessity of seriously considering the intrigues of Muslim leaders that are going on at present.

The proposition with regard to the inter-relation between Hindusthan and Afghanistan enunciated above is apparent in the situation and discernible to any sane observer. Even the Simon Commission appointed by the Imperial Government had to accept the proposition. In the first part of the report, the Commission says :

"There is manifestly no question of extending representative institutions or ministerial control to the Tribal tracts. But the problem of the administration of justice and of promoting and preserving order in the five districts is *intimately and indeed inextricably* connected with the Tribal tracts. Many of the tribesmen who live in the unadministered area in the summer pass into the districts for the winter ; others of the tribesmen own or cultivate land on both sides of the line. A large part of the violent crime which is committed in the districts may be safely attributed to men who live in the tribal area or take refuge in it to escape from the police. An important part of the work of a Political Agent is to induce the headman of a tribe beyond the administered border to discourage such crimes, to get stolen property restored, and even to return inhabitants of a district who may have been kidnapped. Moreover, the statesman who is prepared to face the greater issues that are involved in the constitutional problem of the North West Frontier Province *must not confine his attention* to the five districts and the adjoining tracts. On the other side of the Durand line is the Sovereign State of Afghanistan, with a population largely composed of wild tribesmen with the closest racial affinities to the tribes under the control of the Government of India. Just as there is constant movement to and fro of the Pathans between the districts of the North West Frontier Province and the adjoining Tribal tracts, so there is a constant movement between these Tribal tracts and Afghanistan. The

proceeds of a burglary in Peshawar or of a looted caravan on the Khyber, may be sold in the bazars of Kabul and *when the relatives of the situation are examined on the spot, one is driven to admit that the artificial line which theorist may draw between one particular area and another, cannot affect the essential unity of the problem of the Law and Order in this part of the world.* In fact, the question of Law and Order which in other parts of India is a domestic and internal matter, in the North West Frontier Province is closely related to the subjects of foreign and diplomatic policy and of Imperial defence."

We hope that our critics will be wiser after reading this extract from the Simon Commision Report.



## V

Those of our countrymen, who are anxious about all other people except their own may not appreciate the survey of the relations between Hindusthan and Afghanistan that is made in the foregoing articles. My Marxist friends tell me in so many words that their opinions will not be changed by my writings, nor will mine be changed by theirs. All the same they should, for once, consider the following elucidation of the fundamental divergence between National and Universal brotherhood. I would request them to desist from misleading the nationalist public by showing an apparent similarity between the divergent principles.

A man can love himself, his family or his country. It is generally inferred from this that he can similarly love the whole of humanity. The inference appears to be correct at first sight. It is however entirely erroneous because the feeling of love is an exclusive feeling. When a human being loves a particular individual he does it to the exclusion of

other individuals of the same type. When he loves his country he does it to the exclusion of other countries. The idea of loving the whole of humanity is absurd for this very reason. Because in that case he has nothing of the same type to the exclusion of which he can love humanity. A man may be indifferent to all and incapable of loving a particular section to the exclusion of others. But that does not mean that he loves all mankind. It only means, that he can view all with detachment. There is a vast difference between this detachment and love. The individual, who views all humanity with complete detachment, becomes incapable of taking part in the struggle for existence of a nation.

Those who cannot distinguish between nationals and aliens and have no desire to devote their energies to the uplift of their own people are therefore unfit to become the nationals of any nation.

To put it in a simpler form, love depends on the instinct of choice. Without that instinct one will be incapable of leading even a family life, and still more to exercise the right of citizenship. I therefore, maintain that those who indulge in the illogical tall talk of loving all mankind really misguide the ignorant public and thereby ruin their own nation. This kind of talk secures them publicity in other nations. But it is secured at the cost of the interest of their own nation. The more the publicity, the greater does his power become to ruin his own nation.

To work for the interest of your own people to the exclusion of others is possible only if you take pride in your own people. For this reason people of every nation take pride in their particular culture and its peculiarity, and strive in every way to advance it and maintain it. For this reason too they are ever ready to resist any attack on these objects of their pride.

If this feeling of resistance is absent, we will lose not only the pride but also our special national culture and our separate existence. Those, who prefer this state of things are at liberty to go in for it. Those however, who prize their nationalism and who are keen on the uplift of their own country, should never run after the advocates of any mythical philosophy of love, who misguide them and their nation. I know that the Jain philosophy asks you to discard pride ; but to discard it, is like eliminating your own heart. Once this pride is abandoned, the man becomes a heartless and insensible brute. I do not understand how he can be called a human being. This divorce from reason and emotion makes you heartless. Such a divorce is the chief sign and the cause of a nation's ruin.

The nation is an entity created by a section of mankind to protect itself from aliens. This does not mean that the families or groups of different families who constitute the nation have become completely unified. Their internal rivalries continue; still the groups are ever-ready to run to the protection of any single group or family amongst them, from the aggression of an alien nation.. Living in a particular field of existence all are prepared to protect all their common interests. Sir Theodor Morrison who was once the Principal of the Aligarh College says :

“ The important thing is that the people who inhabit one locality, should be knit to each other by firmer bonds than the links of sympathy which unite them to the inhabitants of other countries.”

This criterion appears plausible on first thought, still it is incapable of controlling the internal rivalries and of preserving the unity of the nation from the fissiparous tendency created by an excess of such rivalries. Without the historical memory of the aggressions of other nations and the feelings

of hate and resentment fostered thereby, no nation can be based on secure foundations. The feeling of national unity is fostered by the danger from enemies from outside. In the absence of such external pressure the fissiparous tendencies in the nation are encouraged.

The feeling of nationality is similar to our lungs. They can work as long as there is a certain atmospheric pressure.

As the intensity of the pressure is lowered, the lungs become incapable of functioning.

From all this reasoning we come to the conclusion that those people who feel the danger from adjoining nations can alone be the constituents and citizens of the nation. Those who are more anxious about the welfare of other countries than that of their mother-country are totally unfit to enjoy the privileges of citizenship in their homeland. If once this reasoning is understood, the problem is satisfactorily explained. We know by experience that the responsibility of protecting Hindusthan rests on Hindus alone and Gandhiji himself has also admitted this fact in an important article discussing the subject of the extent of Hindu co-operation with the Khilafat Movement in 'Young India' dated 23-6-1920. In it Gandhiji writes :

"Whilst I am considering the Hindu connection with the Khilafat Movement, even at the risk of repetition I would like to clear up my own position. As I consider the Muslim claim to be intrinsically (as distinguished from religiously) just, I propose to go with them to the extent of fullest Non-co-operation. And I consider it to be perfectly consistent with my loyalty to the British connection. But I would not go with the Mussalmans in any campaign of violence. I could not help them in promoting, for instance, an invasion of India through Afghanistan or otherwise,

for the purpose of forcing better peace-terms. It is I hold, the duty of every Hindu to resist any inroad on India even for the purpose specified, as it is his duty to help his Mussalman brethren to satisfy their just demands by means of non-co-operation or other form of suffering no matter how great, so long as it does not involve loss of India's liberty or inflicting of violence on any person."

It is necessary to analyse this passage further as it throws light on several important questions. The first thing is the promise which Gandhiji gave to the Hindu leaders that he will not help to transform the Khilafat movement in an Afghan invasion of India. There is evidence to show that even this promise was not given honestly. Because, before giving this promise, Gandhiji had opened negotiations with Afghan representatives through Pandit Jawaharlal and Motilal Nehru in May 1920.

The purpose of this promise was to induce a staunch nationalist like Lokamanya Tilak to join the Khilaphat movement. When the very basis of this promise is in this way questionable it is needless to enter into the question how far the promise was kept up afterwards. Still Hindus with short memories, must be reminded of the writings of Gandhiji in 1921 who in 1920 had said, that it was the duty of every Hindu to resist a foreign invasion. In 1921 Gandhiji wrote as follows :

"I would in a sense certainly assist the Amir of Afghanistan if he waged war against the British Government.

"I would rather see India perish at the hands of the Afghans than purchase freedom from Afghan invasion at the cost of her honour."

Some of my Gandhian friends complain that the interpretations put by me on Gandhiji's writings are misleading

but as long as they do not care to place their own correct interpretations before the public I must stick to mine. Gandhiji has admitted the fact that it is the duty of Hindus alone to resist a foreign invasion. Gandhiji, therefore, cannot object to my statement that Hindus alone can be the nation in Hindusthan. It is also plain from his quotations given above that Gandhiji himself did the very opposite of what he said to be the duty of every Hindu. This also proves that he has no more the moral right to speak on behalf of Hindus.

Even in the days of Hindu-Muslim unity, it is to be noted that Gandhiji puts the whole responsibility of defending India on Hindus alone. The younger brothers *viz.* Muslims were to come in only to share the fruits. It must be mentioned, however, that it is wounding their religious susceptibilities to call them brothers. Those who advise the Hindus to placate the Muslims as their younger brothers need be told that the followers of the Islamic faith would regard it as an insult to call the idolators—Hindus, as their brothers. The report of the Khilafat Conference of 1926 records the following incident :

“Feelings ran so high that when a member referred to the Hindus as ‘brethren’ there was an outburst from a considerable section of the audience, who demanded the withdrawal of the word ‘brethren’ and objected to its application to kafirs.”

In the resolution enunciating the ideal of the Muslim League, Gandhiji's favourite Ali Brothers expressed the same feeling in a more diplomatic form. The resolution ran as follows :

“To promote the friendship and union between the Mussalmans and other communities of India; to maintain and



strengthen the brotherly relations between the Mahomedans of India and those of other countries."

The distinction observed by referring to relations with Hindus at home with the word friendship and the relations with Muslims in foreign land, by the words 'brotherly relations' may not be understood by Gandhiji who is beguiled by the so-called nationalist Muslims. Its significance will however be fully appreciated by people of the Hindu Sabha mentality.

## NATIONALIST MUSLIMS

In my article on the Partition of Hindusthan I had quoted the opinion of high placed Government officials that the term nationalist Muslims involves a self-contradiction. The present article tries to demonstrate how these so-called nationalist Muslims betray their inherent communalism. This exposure would serve to clear the delusion that is involved in the term nationalist Muslims. Their nationalism will be seen in its true colour if we refer to their policy towards the Communal Decision.

Sjt. Subhash Chandra Bose has expressed his astonishment with regard to the attitude of the Muslims in the course of a letter to the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee wherein he says :

“ The so-called Communal Award is not a settled fact and the constitution which is based, not on the principle of unification but on the principles of division, is a pernicious evil. As we have to continue our agitation for a popular constitution, we have simultaneously to continue our demand for a national basis for that constitution. To my Muslim friends and colleagues, I may say that the opposition to the so-called Communal Award does not imply any change in my public attitude. Rather their present non-committal attitude in the place of their former condemnatory attitude, towards communal electorate, shows that they have changed fundamentally. It is now an open secret that the Congress policy on this point was dictated by desire to placate Dr. Ansari and the nationalist Muslims. How the nationalist Muslims who have up-till-now consistently

condemned the Communal electorate, could give up that opposition on the occasion of the Award passes my comprehension. Was their former attitude insincere? Or have they altered their position fundamentally? In either case, we cannot be blamed for condemning communal electorate in the new constitution in keeping with our eternal nationalistic principles. "

Two things have come to light from this letter. The first is, that Dr. Ansari and other nationalist Muslim leaders completely betrayed the Hindu leaders in the Congress. The second fact is, that those Hindu leaders who refused to be guided by Dr. Ansari in this matter were denounced as communalists by the so-called nationalist Muslims. The culprits themselves thus became the accusers.

Our Congress friends may not perhaps accept the version of Sjt. Bose because he is now ex-communicated. They will however respect Jawaharlal's opinion as he has thrice adorned the presidential Gadi. And Jawaharlal holds the same opinion as that of Subhash Bose. In a statement issued from Lahore on 2nd June 1936, Panditji says :

"I cannot conceive anyone thinking clearly in terms of Independence or of social change accepting or approving of the Communal Decision. It has been a matter of great surprise and regret to me that many of our Muslim friends and comrades who have stood for Indian Independence should so approve of this pernicious decision. "

That the Pandit was surprised at the Muslim attitude shows only his ignorance of human nature.

The nationalist Muslims have several times explained the reason of their treachery to their Congress friends. Asaf Ali, the chief whip of the Congress Assembly Party, in a letter to Mr. Jinnah written on 23rd May 1937, writes as follows :

"In 10 out of 11 provinces the substance of your 14 points has been conceded and the percentage in services has been fixed. Is the Communal Award another bone of contention? The Congress is pledged to seek no alteration of it by invoking outside aid. When it is done it must be done by agreement among contending parties. The culture, language, script and religion of minorities are already guaranteed. What else is there?"

Let us now turn to Dr. Syed Mahamud the well-known Muslim leader from Bihar. In a statement issued from Delhi on 10-10-37, Dr. Mahamud writes :

"The Communal Award is there. Nobody has touched it and nobody is going to touch it so long as the Muslims desire it. The Congress may not have accepted it in principle but it has practically accepted it in all its real effects and our community is quite free to reap the benefit of the Communal Award."

After the publication of this statement from Dr. Mahamud, Muslim leaders demanded that the Congress Working Committee should support that statement. And on 30th Oct. 1937, Barr. Asaf Ali issued another statement in which he requested the Congress Working Committee to clarify its attitude with regard to the minorities. The Working Committee conceded this request, and the very next day it passed the following resolution :

"The Congress has declared that a change in or supersession of the Communal Decision should only be brought about by the mutual agreement of the parties concerned."

After being relieved in this way of their anxiety, the leader of the Muslim League—Nawab Mahamad Ismail Khan—in a letter to Pt. Jawaharlal, wrote as follows :

"Your recent resolution on the Communal Award has

certainly removed one great grievance of the Muslim community, and we trust it will be allowed to stand."

Gandhiji himself is directly responsible for this policy of placating the Muslims at the cost of the fundamental principles of the Congress. In his letter to Mr. Jinnah dated 24th August 1938, Gandhiji says :

'So far as I am concerned just as on the Hindu-Muslim question, I was guided by Dr. Ansari, now that he is no more in our midst, I have accepted Maulana Abul Kalam Azad as my guide."

Nationalist Hindus have not yet fully realised the double dealing of Maulana Azad ; for their benefit the following quotation from an interview given by Azad to the 'Free Press' at Calcutta on 1st Sept. 1932, has been reproduced. The quotation is taken from 'Communal Award' published with a foreward by Sir C. Y. Chintamani. The interview was as follows :

"Maulana Azad felt that the criticisms in the 'Nationalist Press' in Calcutta and elsewhere, were on the wrong lines and were misleading. Instead of telling the Muslims that they got nothing despite their unceasing loyalty at the cost of the country's interest, and inviting them to a common programme of action, the 'Nationalist Press' had been bewailing the supposed Muslim raj. The Award, the Maulana proceeded, has given the Muslims only one of their famous Fourteen Points, namely, separate electorate. It has not placed the Muslims in a permanent statutory majority in Bengal. Concluding, he hoped that Maulvi Ismail Khan and Mr. Masud Ahmad will try to explore fresh avenues of negotiations with the Congress and the said communalist Muslims would be exposed in their true colours, if the Hindus take a bold

attitude and offer a statutory majority to the Muslims on the basis of joint electorate."

We have already quoted above the confession of Barr. Asaf Ali to the effect that the Communal Decision granted the Muslims the substance of their Fourteen Points. The decision has created a Muslim raj in Bengal, and put the Hindus in a deplorable situation. In face of this, the above interview of Maulana Azad being full of dissimulation and deliberate falsehoods, would really exasperate any honest man. And it is this Maulana that is going to teach us nationalism from the presidential seat of the Congress!

It will be interesting at this stage to compare the pseudo-nationalism of Maulana Azad with the true nationalism of Dr. Moonje. While M. Azad was trying to secure the statutory majority to Muslims in provinces like Bengal, Barr. Asaf Ali announced in a statement:

"There is not a shadow of doubt that with joint electorate and no reservation, no weightage and no special constituencies in the Punjab, and even on the basis of the franchise recommended by the Lothian Committee, the Musalmans would win some 60 per cent and odd seats in the provincial legislature. The Sikhs and the Hindus of Dr. Moonje's school of thought insist on the above formula."

It will be seen from this statement that if the Muslim leaders had proved their nationalism by consenting to joint electorates, Hindu and Sikh minorities in Punjab and Bengal, were advised by Dr. Moonje, not to ask for any weightage or protection for themselves. And yet in the eyes of Congressmen Asaf Ali and Azad are nationalists and Dr. Moonje is anti-nationalist. Our only prayer on the occasion of this Congress session is that God may save Hindusthan from the pseudo-nationalism of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.

## CONCLUSION

Those who have read the foregoing pages must have realised that Gandhiji has been treading the path of high treason to the Hindu nation for the last twenty years at least. And we regret to say that this sin is shared by all the Hindu followers of Gandhiji. It might be that they were unaware of the Gandhi-Muslim conspiracy to establish Muslim Raj in India. We admire their devotion to their leader and we know that many of them mean well. But all their sacrifice was to no purpose so far as the interests of the Hindu nation were concerned; on the contrary it proved detrimental to them. We have no inclination to condemn them in such harsh terms as the gravity of their errors in fact demand. But if they persist in following the same treasonable path in future we shall have to treat them as the enemies of the Hindu nation. In spite of their eminent personal qualities and lofty aims they are as dangerous to the Hindu nation as the bigoted followers of Jinnah are. There is a lurking suspicion in the minds of Hindusabhaits that their brand of patriotism is somewhat inferior to that of the Congressites. They must shed this inferiority-complex. They must not hanker after the recognition of their patriotism by Congressmen. The president of the Hindu Mahasabha in his presidential address at Calcutta has remarked that the Congress as a body has been ungrateful to a degree in failing to appreciate the patriotic sacrifice and service, the Hindu Mahasabhaits have rendered equally with and in cases even far more intensely than the Congressites in the fight for the freedom of Hindusthan. If this fact is admitted then the reason for it must be sought in the treasonable intrigues of the Congress high-way command.

Before proceeding further we want to remove an illusion from the public mind that the Congress in its present complexion can ever be a nationalist institution. Today it is dominated by a clique of pacifists, pan-Islamists and Marxists. On principle the pacifists are opposed to the defence of the nation from foreign aggression. Consequently, they become traitors to the nation. Pan-Islamism means the domination of Arabia and its culture ( if it possesses any ) over the whole world or at least over the Islamic world in which the Muslims include India, as is well illustrated by the speech of Hakim Ajmalkhan at Ahmedabad. Hence they are avowed enemies of the Hindu nation. The Marxists will take it as an insult if we accuse them of nationalism ; for, a nationalist Marxist will mean a national socialist, in fact a Nazi. They proudly proclaim themselves to be the fifth columnists of Russia. There are some leaders like Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel who are neither pacifists, nor pan-Islamists, and can never be Marxists. If they raise their dissentient voice it is quickly smothered by this wicked combination. At the Poona Session of the A. I. C. C. Sardar Vallabhbhai carried through a resolution insisting on the necessity of a national army for an Independent India. But even the redoubtable Sardar had to taste defeat at the hands of this unholy alliance in Bombay. This incident alone is sufficient to convince the intelligent public that there is no room for nationalism in the present constitution of the Congress. If leaders of the calibre of Sardar Vallabhbhai cannot lead this institution to the path of nationalism it must be destroyed, otherwise it will bring ruin and destruction in every Hindu home. At the end of 1939 Sardar Vallabhbhai himself admitted in a public speech at Bombay that in its efforts to placate the Muslims the Congress was wandering away from the path of nationalism. " It is difficult " observed the Sardar, " to understand the



position of the Muslim League. What does it want? The Congress has made friendly approaches repeatedly but every time it has met with a rebuff. The Congress overruled its revered leader Pandit Malaviyaji and did not reject the Communal Award. The League goes on rejecting whatever is offered without formulating its own demands." Pandit Malaviyaji, almost the only Congressman, who stood for genuine nationalism was unceremoniously driven out of the Congress in order to satisfy the anti-national cravings of the Muslims. When this fact is publicly admitted by Sardar Vallabhbhai himself, we do not understand, why the Hindu leaders are not prepared to denounce frankly that the Congress is an organisation of traitors. Pandit Malaviyaji has been in the black list of the Muslims since he refused to invite the Amir. On account of his great influence with the Princes and orthodox Hindu leaders his word would have been decisive. Barrister Alfred Nundy has mentioned in his work on 'Indian Unrest' 1919-20, "In the Subjects Committee of the Congress at Nagpur, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya speaking on Mr. Gandhi's draft resolution in respect to the change of creed eliminating the British connection made the remark "we are not prepared yet to fight to gain this end." Mr. Shaukat Ali interrupted him with the observation "*Yes we are. I can promise an army if you will lead.*" (p 184). This sally of the Big Brother expresses his ill concealed irritation at Malaviyaji's refusal to invite the Amir. In spite of such sallies Malaviyaji refused to budge an inch from his stand of unadulterated nationalism. And hence his expulsion from the Congress means the expulsion of genuine nationalism.

Muslim conspiracies are as deep rooted as their enmities. The Hindu public might have been surprised with the extent of Nizam's ambitions as revealed by Gandhiji's recent article on Hyderabad. For their edification we quote the following

from 'Indian Unrest' by Alfred Nundy. "The Nizam's Minister in his Communique to the press made a barefaced bid on his behalf for the Khilafat, so far as the Muslims of India are concerned. The ruler of the Hyderabad State was credited with a capacity equal in ability, wisdom and statesmanship to some of the most illustrious Caliphs of the old and by-gone repositories of Islamic civilization! His dominions were described as vast, richly endowed by nature, with a population below normal, immune from foreign invasion and with every possibility of advancement and prosperity for the Muslims. And it was alleged that "Hyderabad has all the potentialities of Bagdad and Cordova, and is the one place on earth where Mussalmans may hold their heads high and aspire to rise to the flood level of Islamic culture." As to Afghanistan to which the Moslem eyes were turned, the country was described as composed of barren rocks and sandy planes in which nature has always refused to produce sufficient food, for even the sparse population that inhabits it, and where a stable government is and always has been an uncertainty in striking contrast to a country which in glowing terms was credited with being more favourably placed than any province in British India." (pp. 62-63)

In 1921 the Muslims of India were fascinated by the personality of Amir Amanullah. And so the eyes of all Khilafatists were turned to him including those of Gandhiji. Since the advent of the new dynasty, the new Amir does not feel himself secure in his throne. So he has given up active interference in Indian politics. Naturally the Khilafatists including Gandhiji were out to find some other champion of their cause. In the meanwhile the Nizam of Hyderabad had contracted a matrimonial alliance with the ex-Sultan of Turkey and thus strengthened his claim for the Caliphate. But one of the main objections to his claim was his dependence

on the British. Since that time the power of the British government is on the decline and consequently Nizam's efforts to achieve full sovereignty are being pursued with renewed vigour. Responsible Muslim leaders have been insisting on the grant of the title of 'His Majesty' to his Exalted Highness the Nizam. Nizam's minions are proclaiming that he possesses that title by inherent right and no one need confer it upon him. All these things lead to the only conclusion that the Muslims of India are now ready to consider the Nizam as their future Caliph and Gandhiji being subservient to the Muslim leaders, he is also hastening to pay his homage to the future Emperor of India.

We have been endeavouring to concentrate the attention of the Hindu public on this question of life and death for our nation for the last eighteen months. But we regret to find that the Hindus are treating this matter with absolute indifference. The only occasion on which they shed their indifference is when we venture to call the betrayers of our nation by their proper name. We are forced to pass the above remark by the general opposition which we experienced to the title of this pamphlet. We are amazed to find that the exposure of these conspiracies in no way shocks the public but only the attack on the personages involved in the conspiracies shocks them. But the Hindus ought to remember that the nation has a greater sanctity than individuals, however eminent they may be. The worship of an individual is always detrimental to the nation. As Barrister Jamnadas Mehta has already remarked at a lecture in Poona that the Mahatma is becoming greater and greater, and India is becoming smaller and smaller. The indignation which moves the public when the reputation of their leaders is at stake is not exhibited when national interests are at stake. Indifference to the national interests is the bane of our nation

in the past as well as in the present. If the public had any consciousness of the national interests those who commit Himalayan mistakes would have been, by now, confined to the Himalayan caves. A leader who commits such blunders would have been forced to commit 'Harakiri' in patriotic Japan, but he is enthroned as a dictator in our traitor's asylum called India.

Treason is the most infectious disease. An individual can only point out those who are contaminated with this disease or those who are the carriers of this disease. It is beyond individual capacity to take measures to protect the society from this disease. In independent nations this is the function of the State. The Hindu nation has no national government. But there is the Hindu Mahasabha which speaks for this nation and looks after its interests. Hence the Hindu Mahasabha must take cognisance of the traitors in our society and find out ways and means to protect the nation from them. When in February last Gandhiji took notice of our accusations, he did so because the charges were authoritatively repeated by the President of the Hindu Mahasabha at Calcutta. Gandhiji has mentioned in his reply "But I see that it has gone through a revised and enlarged edition in the Hindu Mahasabha." As Gandhiji has thrown the gauntlet, the Hindu Mahasabha can neglect it only at its peril. As an answer to this challenge the Hindu Mahasabha ought to appoint a committee authoritatively to investigate these accusations. We hope that the Hindu Mahasabha will prove by its action that it is the true guardian of the Hindu nation.

It is not our intention to dethrone the present leadership and replace it by another of the same sort. We want to replace the current anti-national ideology by one which is in conformity with the spirit, tradition, and interests of our nation. An ideology which is antagonistic to the spirit and experience of our nation creates a division in our own

rank and favours only the enemies. In place of the individual leadership we want the leadership of the nation, i.e. the leadership of those who identify themselves completely with the destiny of our nation. In that leadership we should be able to see the image of our nation in its true form.

The Hindu nation is the oldest and loneliest and at present the most helpless of all nations. Except a few European professors of Sanskrit no body cares at all for our culture. There is absolutely no chance of our gaining any sympathy or help from outside. We have to depend on our own strength. In these circumstances if we do not devote ourselves wholeheartedly to our national cause, we are doomed. We shall not tolerate an outrage on any helpless human being in our presence. We shall do everything in our power to prevent it. But it is a wonder that while our nation is outraged and molested even those who call themselves nationalists take no steps to defend it. The shame at the outrages that are being daily committed on helpless Hindus in different parts of India ought to be our constant companion and determine the path we ought to follow.

Finally, I must appeal to the Hindu nationalists, not to trust henceforth that unblushing and confirmed mis-leader, the so-called Mahatma. He had written in 'Young India' of 18-5-21, "Let us remember that there is nothing to prevent them (the Afghans) from overrunning India today, if they wished to." And yet he has the temerity to write in 'Harijan' of 10-2-40, "I have too great a respect for English bravery and arms to think that an invasion of India can be successful without a strong combination of different powers." So, "I would not be guilty of inviting any power to invade India." The contradiction between the two passages is too obvious, to need any comment. Falsehood thy name is Gandhi!

## APPENDIX

### I

#### Mr. SHASTRI INTERVIEWED

##### PILING UP OF FIGURES IN THE MILITARY BUDGET

**Q.**—Is this the only evil result of the movement?

**A.**—I wish I could say so. Whatever its apostles may say, other people cannot regard it as an inflexibly peaceful movement. It has therefore, had its own share in the piling up of figures in the military budget. Fears are entertained, we can only hope they are unfounded, that the frontier and transfrontier troubles are in part at least encouraged and stimulated by the unprecedented unrest caused by the non-co-operation movement. It sounds a strong thing to say and I have no facts on which to proceed, but there is nothing inherently improbable in a powerful movement designed to overthrow Government, though only by peaceful means, being regarded by aliens as a propitious occasion for their aggressive schemes. And neither the Government nor those who wish its maintenance can afford to keep that probability out of their calculations.

##### STEM THE TIDE OF REVOLUTION

**Q.**—Do you observe that Lala Lajpat Rai distinguishes between those co-operators who are neutral and those who have taken sides openly with Government?

**A.**—Yes. And I take leave to think that between these two classes the latter are the more alive to their duties. I am clear that any one who regards non-co-operation as an evil is bound to combat it. To stand by and leave Government

to do the entire fighting is to hold that society ought not to protect itself when anarchy rears its head. In such a crisis any Government might justly seek the active help of its loyal subjects. Certainly, the British Government, today, which has transferred part of its responsibility to the representatives of the people and in my belief, honestly means to transfer more and more, deserves such active help in tenfold measure. I do not blush for the Moderates who have taken office, and, in the words of Lala Lajpat Rai, give their legal as well as moral support to Government in this anxious time. They are doing the country the greatest service in trying to stem the tide of revolution. I am aware of the old old anti-thesis between treason to the people and treason to the king with which strong propagandists can make effective play, but I am not frightened. I will content myself with pleading not guilty of either form of treason and expressing the hope that my critics could do the same without violating their conscience.

—'The Leader' 11-4-21



## II

### INDIA AND AFGHANISTAN

Mr. Mohamed Ali evidently thinks that his existence is indispensable for the stability of the British Empire. Speaking recently in Madras, he declared that 'the incarceration of each one of us' (himself and his brother) means freedom of the nation. 'The death of each one of us in the cause of the nation means the life of the nation itself.' Proceeding he stated :—

"If Lord Reading, or Sir William Vincent or any one in Indian Civil Service desire to take us to prison, or to deprive us of our lives I can assure them they will be hastening the

day when the British Empire would have ended and that would be the death knell of the British Empire. I am quite content that my brother and I give up our lives if at the same time the British Empire should also breathe its last. ”

Out of all this vapouring of conceit and self-importance one notable fact emerges and it is a consuming sense of hatred of the British Empire. Mr. Mohamed Ali would die happy and contented if his death coincided with the expiry of the Empire. He seems to be obsessed with the thought that his liberty is in danger or that his life is threatened. He asked, ‘what are we to be killed for ?’ We do not know if any one ever proposed that his earthly existence should be cut short. But how else can prejudice be worked up against a ‘satanic’ Government except by making such wild and unfounded suggestions? Continuing his rambling speech he told his audience that he had heard that Dr. Sapru was going to make some sensational disclosures and that his brother, had informed him that Dr. Sapru would reveal in that round table conference which is to take place about frontier politics disclosures of a private conference held in June last between him and my brother in which he discussed what was the political attitude of the Mussalmans in India at the present moment towards Afghanistan. And then he observed, as if to frighten Dr. Sapru, that he was not quite sure whether there would not be any disclosures of a talk which Mr. Mohamed Ali had with Dr. Sapru in railway train, in which the latter said things which were not in favour of the Government of which he is a member today.

Whatever Dr. Sapru might have said we are perfectly certain that he could have said nothing which indicated or implied that he would welcome the invasion of India by a foreign power and would help it in any circumstances in



overthrowing British rule. But what is and has been the position of Mr. Mohamed Ali. We will quote his own words :—

“ Whatever disclosure there was to make about the attitude of the Mussalmans in India towards Afghanistan and an invasion of India from the outside, has been made in our letter to the Viceroy of India sent from the jail in Baitoul. We said early in that letter that if the Amir of Afghanistan or any outside power—Germans or Bolsheviks—Bolsheviks were not discovered then or the Turks or any outside power comes to invade our country and its people and to subjugate them, we shall not only assist but we shall consider it our duty to lead the resistance in India. Slaves once, we do not want to be made slaves again. But if the Amir of Kabul does not enslave India and does not want to subjugate the people of India who have never done any harm and who do not mean to do the slightest harm to the people of Afghanistan or elsewhere, but if he comes to fight against those who have always had an eye on his country, who wanted to subjugate his people, who hold the holy places of Islam, who want to crush Islam in their hostile grip, who want to destroy the Muslim faith and who were bent on destroying the Khilafat, then not only shall we assist but it will be our duty and the duty of everyone who calls himself a Mussalman to gird up his loins and fight the good fight of Islam.”

Let us analyse what this means. The Afghans have only to declare when invading India that their quarrel is only with the Government of India and not with the people and the Ali brothers with their followers will without further ado not only assist them in their invasion but will regard it as their duty to gird up their loins and ‘ fight the good fight of Islam.’ In the ‘ good fight of Islam ’ Indian nationalism will be thrown overboard and the love of India which

Mr. Mohamed Ali professes will disappear. The Amir of Kabul and his advisers will be utter idiots if they declared when invading India that their aim was to enslave its people or to rule over them. Whatever their ulterior designs, and they cannot be the liberation of India, they will take care to say that their fight was with the British Government and not with the people. And then the Ali brothers will feel justified in working up a Muslim revolt in the country. Where Hindu-Muslim unity and the cry of nationalism will then be we do not know. We would ask the true nationalists in this country to open their eyes widely and realize betimes whither the country is being led. If we are able to read the significance of events right then the strenuous efforts that are being made by a few clever persons to bring about anarchy are probably meant to afford the opportunity for an external invasion, which may be a signal for those who have never made secret of their extra-territorial patriotism to declare themselves openly on the side of the invaders. Why are negotiations being prolonged by Afghanistan? Are the astute Afghans waiting upon events in India to declare themselves definitely on one side or the other? Suppose the non-co-operation movement succeeded in paralysing the Government tomorrow. Will not the Afghans then break off the negotiations and declare war, and assisted by the Bolsheviks, try to overrun the country. Let every Indian deeply and in a responsible spirit ponder over the situation and then decide what his duty is, whether it is to inflame the popular mind or to restrain and educate it on the right lines and to help the Government in maintaining order and respect for authority. It is all very well to extol the non-co-operation movement on the ground that it has led to the unprecedented awakening among the people, but will this awakening be a blessing or a curse if it leads to wide-spread outbreaks and

defiance to authority which in turn encourages the enemy at the gate. Let us leave all theories aside and look at the whole situation, internal and external, from a commonsense as well as a patriotic point of view. If the non-co-operation movement is playing any part in the prolongation of the Afghan negotiations and is obstructing the path of peace with Afghanistan, we think it is the duty of Government of India to find some means of explaining the whole situation to those leaders at least, to whatever school of politics they may belong, who do not desire to sever the British connection or invite an Afghan invasion to repel which India will have pay heavily.

—'The Leader' 23-4-21



### III

#### THE AFGHAN QUESTION

MR. MOHAMED ALI DEFINES <sup>had any</sup> ATTITUDE

A representative of this paper called on Mr. Mohamed Ali at Anand Bhavan on the morning of the 10th May to interview him on the Afghan Question. The latter handed over to him the report of the interview given by him to a representative of the 'Independent' asking him to read it aloud. The following is the interview in question as corrected by Mr. Mohamed Ali while it was being read to him and a number of friends sitting by his side including his brother Mr. Shaukat Ali :

Q.—Mr. Gandhi has said in his article on the ' Afghan Bogey ' that he would assist the Amir if he waged war against the British Government but assist him only in the sense that he would refuse any help to that Government. Do you agree with him ?

A.—I entirely agree.

Q.—Would you in any circumstances go farther than Mr. Gandhi would ?

A.—Only in one case am I required by my faith to go farther than that. If I am thoroughly convinced that a real *Jehad* is being waged and I am in a position to assist actively, whether with money or as a fighting unit or in any other way, then I am required by Islam to render that assistance to the *Mujahedeen*.

Q.—In case a *Jehad* is declared, would you have no discretion left to you? What about the Hindu-Muslim compact, which Mr. Gandhi contends, is in its very nature indissoluble ?

A.—If the *Jehad* is declared by the Khalifa himself, I do not think I have any discretion left, except that I must calculate whether I am in a position to render active help or not. But in every other case, I have full discretion to judge whether the same objective cannot more effectively be gained by other means. If our non-violent non-co-operation can bring about the redress of the *Khilafat* wrongs—as I hope and believe it will—I am not required by my faith to give up non-violence, and resort to force. For my own part, I prefer non-violent non-co-operation, because not only do I believe that it would be successful for the redress of the *Khilafat* wrong, but because it would be more effective than any other means for the emancipation of India. It means the minimum sacrifice with the maximum number, which will in the end, be far more effective than the maximum sacrifice with the minimum number. I cannot for ever rule out the possibility of force like Mahatma Gandhi; but for a nation of 30 crores of people, I consider force to be absolutely needless, while their non-co-operation is the one thing that will remove their present demoralisation. Indian emancipation through the force of a few will not remove that demoralisation.

tion so thoroughly and so permanently as the non-violent non-co-operation of millions. I would make my point still clearer. So far as I can judge, the Hindu-Muslim compact is indissoluble, and it is sufficient for the purpose of retrieving the honour of Islam. Whilst violence is permissible in Islam, it does not permit the Faithful to throw away a single life uselessly. In my Madras speech, I had given the Islamic Law. What is practicable and desirable for our purpose had, I thought, been made perfectly clear in my previous speeches. I state, however, once for all, that we are as much wedded to non-violence as the Hindus. Our interests are common and identical. I will also add that I shall continue to safeguard the interests of my country and its liberty against all comers, Muslim or non-Muslim. If, for instance, any Muslim power proclaimed a Jihad and having defeated the present Government, wanted to settle down in India as its rulers, it will be my duty to oust such rulers from India by using every means allowed to me by my faith.

Q.—You then assume that a possible Jihad declared by the Amir against the British Government is inconsistent with his desire for dominion ?

A.—Absolutely. And if any one wants India to remain immune from a foreign invasion, he should use all his influence with the present Government to evacuate the Holy Places of Islam and to abandon its policy of relentless dismemberment of the Khilafat. This Afghan Bogey would never trouble the dreams of the most nervous Indian, if responding to the public opinion of India, the present Government gives up its anti-Islamic policy. But those of my countrymen who are frightened by this bogey are not fully responsible for their fears. They are in a hypnotic trance today, and acting as a medium on an outside suggestion. This is the

latest trick of the 'Divide and Rule' jugglers and one more manifestation of slave mentality.

**Q.**—Evidently, then, Swaraj is as much near to your heart as to that of the Hindus, and there is no meaning in the charge that 'the Ali Brothers are pan-Islamist first and everything else afterwards?'

**A.**—I am a Muslim first and everything else afterwards, just as I believe that Mahatma Gandhi is a Hindu first and everything else afterwards. As a Muslim I must be free and subject to no autocrat who would demand from me obedience to his orders in defiance of those of God. If this autocracy is Muslim it is just as abhorrent to me, as if it was a Hindu. All that Islam demands from me is that I should not live in a land where I could not follow the dictates of my religion with impunity, and it is just because Swaraj will give me that, and the present British autocracy does not, that I yearn for Swaraj and regard its attainment as a religious duty. Faith is my motive of conduct in every act throughout my life, and my faith demands the freedom that Swaraj will give me, but it does not demand the subjugation of Hindus or any one else differing from me in faith. My own freedom and not the enslavement of any other is the desideratum of my creed and no religious preceptor whom I have consulted on this point has differed from this view, so that Swaraj would mean Swadharma and would satisfy all the cravings of my Muslim heart. Islam certainly does not demand the restoration of Moghul, Turkish or Afghan rulers. It only demands the same liberty to practise and preach my faith without resort to any form of compulsion against others. There is no Government but God's says the Koran, and a Muslim is required to resort to force only when there is religious persecution. The Koran strictly lays down the limits of force, which are that it should be used only

until persecution ceases and every one follows his faith for the sake of his God.

Q.—The following observations in your famous Betul letter to the Viceroy are irrespective of any compact with the Hindus. I would like you to explain more clearly the position of the Hindus in the event of your joining an invader in a holy war.

You have said :

“ The clear law of Islam requires that in the first place, in no case whatsoever should a Musalman render any one any assistance against him ; and in the next place, if the Jihad approaches any region, every Musalman in that region must join the Mujahedeen and assist them to the best of his or her power. ”

A.—The question, I think, is partly answered before. But I may add something more. The Hindus are quite welcome to assist their Musalman brethren in their religious war, but there is no compulsion on them to do so, and they can remain perfectly neutral. The Hindu-Muslim unity would still remain unbroken, for Indian Musalmans would still be bound to establish a Government responsible to the United Indian people. We have tasted the cup of slavery to the dregs and know how bitter it is. We have no desire to make any other human being taste the same or continue to do so any longer than we can help.

Q.—One more question and I have done. May I take it that you do not contemplate the possibility of Hindus and Musalmans entering upon a joint armed revolt ?

A.—Nothing has been further from my mind since I have been working with my Guru Mahatma Gandhi. This Afghan hare is none of my starting. For this our friends must thank Sir William Vincent and the distinguished co-workers in the so-called Indian legislatures. I do not remember having said anything about any foreign invasion of India

for more than a year, and all my thoughts were occupied with the early attainment of Swaraj by means of non-violent non-cooperation. Every fibre of me is being strained to its utmost to bring nearer the day of India's freedom through Indian effort alone; and I consider it my mission in life to remove every source of friction, that exists between Hindus and Musalmans so that the two united may achieve their liberation jointly, which either could not do singly as things stand at present. I would not have breathed one word about Afghanistan and its Amir, had not Sir William Vincent started this Afghan hare when all other efforts of separating the Hindus from Musalmans and Musalmans from Hindus had failed. When I read his speech I was about to start for Bezwada and while there I gave to Mahatmaji a copy of the pamphlet 'Freedom of Faith and its Price', which contains our letter to Lord Chelmsford, from Betul Jail. This pamphlet was printed for circulation in England, mainly among British members of Parliament including Col. Yate. I showed to Mahatmaji the very passage on the interpretation of which you have questioned me and I told him that my reply to Sir William Vincent would be a repetition in my forthcoming speech at Madras of the self-same passage. That is precisely what I did, with Mahatmaji's approval and I said that when this letter was written by us we were prisoners in Betul jail and the Government released us some months later. If for holding the same views, the Government is going to send us to prison again, they are quite welcome to do it. Only it would be a madder Government than I ever believed to be. So far as I am concerned, I have chased the hare started by Sir William Vincent sufficiently and killed it. But evidently, for some people it has as many lives as the proverbial cat. All that I can say to them is not with these tremors can the slavery of centuries be ended, but end it we must.



I hope I may say without offence that if 20 crores of Hindus cannot liberate India, without foreign help, I hope and trust that the 7 crores of Musalmans can and will. If the Amir of Afghanistan fights the enemies of Islam, he would have my entire support. If he fights the present Government of India, because they are turbulent neighbours he has my entire sympathy, and he can free Afghanistan from fear by the liberation of India. But I certainly do not invite him to liberate India for the sake of India's liberation. That is not his task, but mine and my Hindu compatriots' and for that we think we are enough. But whether the Hindus join us or not in this holy mission, we can not abandon it, while life lasts and we still retain our love of freedom.

—'The Leader' 12-5-31



#### IV

#### MR. MOHAMED ALI AND JEHAD

A representative of this paper interviewed Mr. Mohamed Ali on the 10th May. The latter handed over to him the report of the interview given by him to a representative of the Independent asking him to read it aloud. This we published yesterday. Our representative then put the following supplementary questions which Mr. Mohamed Ali answered as follows :—

Q.—It is not quite clear from the interview read out by me as to what your attitude will be towards those members of the Hindu community who not only do not assist you in the eventuality of a Jihad, but, on the other hand, assist the Government? Will you please enlighten me on this point?

A.—My attitude will depend upon the attitude of those Hindus themselves. If they shoot me I will shoot them.

Q.—I cannot say if they will shoot you but they will actively assist the Government against the invaders.

A.—You mean, assist the Government when the Mussalmans fight against the enemies of Islam.

Q.—Yes.

A.—Then you may expect the use of force against them also. Force against force.

Q. They will be treated as enemies?

A.—Yes, just as the Arabs and other Muslims treated their own co-religionists from India who fought on behalf of the British Government in Mesopotamia and elsewhere.

Q.—How will you determine, Mr. Mohamed Ali, that a real *Jehad* has been proclaimed or how will you distinguish between an invasion for the purpose of punishing the Government or of conquering the country?

A.—I ask the *Leader* itself to frame a rational formula and I am prepared to consider it. I have no mathematical formula or acid test beyond the criterion of common sense. I shall not go merely on the *ipse dixit* of any one but use all my intelligence to come to a correct decision. I will consult Mahatma Gandhi and other Hindu leaders working with me and I will not easily differ from their judgment.

Q.—You will entirely depend upon Mahatmaji?

A.—I can give no such understanding in a matter of conscience, but at the same time it is not likely that I will differ from Mahatmaji. It will be a complicated affair and no formula can be framed beforehand. I will ask my Hindu fellow-countrymen to find it out for themselves. We would send a Hindu-Muslim deputation, if Government would allow, consisting of Mahatmaji and others. These are not mechanical things to be summed up in an arithmetical formula. As practical men of affairs we shall use our judgment and

arrive at a correct decision. If any man can prepare in advance a formula or chemical reagent as a test by which this question can be decided I am prepared to consider it. We will do our best not to disagree with our Hindu friends. My complaint is that our Hindu friends do not at all carefully study questions of foreign politics, otherwise they would know that no Muslim power at present would dream of attacking its neighbour. It is enough if it is just able to pull through this crisis; not even the Bolsheviki are in such a position. So far as I can make out they do not want to subjugate India but only want to save the proletariat dictatorship in Russia from capitalist England.

Q.—I have one more question to ask you about your denial of the story published by Swami Shraddhanand. Have you denied merely the giving of a letter or even the alleged envoy's visit to you?

A.—I have denied the entire story which is utterly unfounded. No one ever came to me with that purpose and I ask my Hindu friends to believe me.

Q.—Permit me to ask Mr. Shaukat Ali also whether he ever received any such envoy.

A.—( Mr. Shaukat Ali ) Hundreds of people come and see me and for all sorts of purposes. Can you give the month and year?

Q.—I know nothing about, I put the question to you because the spy is alleged to have visited the Ali brothers.

A.—The whole story is absurd. Why should the spy not have come to me first instead of being directed to us through the channel of Malaviyaji and Mahatmaji? I meet the Afghan envoy at Delhi so often and give him money for the *Muhajirin*. Why could not the Amir's regular envoy have asked me all this instead of a spy coming to us

through Malaviyaji and Mahatmaji? I have not received any spy as is alleged in the story.

Mr. Mohamed Ali.—From the time of our internment Government has been trying to injure our reputation and I expect every fair-minded person to insist on the Government clearing up the matter so that it may stand exposed before the country. I asked Mr. Montagu when in England to publish all that the Government had against us but though I wrote this letter to him ( of which I give you a copy ) about a year ago, I have still received no reply except that the Government of India had been referred to and Mr. Montagu was considering the matter.

Q.—You have left out Mahatma Gandhi and Malaviyaji.

A.—I understand Mahatmaji has already written to the *Independent* contradicting the story and whether Malaviyaji does, or does not, it is the duty of the Government to clear up the matter. I cannot conceive of any such political reasons standing in the way of our trial, as have been referred to in a letter by a correspondent of the *Leader*. Let me tell you one thing more. The *Leader* has praised Swami Shraddhanand for saying that Swaraj obtained with the help of a neighbour is worse than hell. I claim equal credit for those sentiments.

—' The Leader' 13-5-21



## V

### Mr. MOHAMED ALI'S EXPLANATION

In the interview which Mr. Mohamed Ali gave to a representative of the *Independent* he attempted to explain away his Erode speech and the passage in the Betul letter which we quoted, and to answer some of the issues raised in our columns with regard to the attitude he would adopt

in case of an Afghan invasion. We must confess that his statement leaves us unconvinced that he has really changed his opinions. We have reasons to believe that some important portions of his statement were inspired by Mr. Gandhi himself, and that the apparent lowering of the banner of Islam in favour of nationalism was dictated by political expediency and opportunism, in as much as it was probably felt that the position that Mr. Mohamed Ali had taken up at Erode would cause a split among Hindu and Muslim non-cooperators. But we are not prepared to accept that Mr. Mohamed Ali has really given up his original position, though he has tried to wriggle out of the difficult situation in which he had placed himself. He reiterated that he was 'Muslim first and everything else afterwards' that 'if the Amir of Afghanistan fights the enemies of Islam, he would have my entire support. If he fights the present Government of India because they are turbulent neighbours he has my entire sympathy, and he can free Afghanistan from fear by the liberation of India' and that 'a possible Jihad declared by the Amir against the British Government is inconsistent with his desire for dominion.' After making these fatal admissions, it is idle for him to camouflage his real position by asserting that every fibre of his was 'being strained to its utmost to bring nearer the day of India's freedom through Indian effort alone', and that 'all my thoughts were occupied with the early attainment of Swaraj by means of non-violent non-cooperation.' Those who have been watching his activities can truthfully say that every fibre of his being and all his thought have been concentrated on the Khilafat question and he has been vowing that unless the Khilafat wrong was redressed he would dig the foundations of the British Empire. Was it for winning Swaraj that he supported the Hijrat movement? Was not the non-cooperation

movement originally started and 'non-violent' war declared against Government in the interests of the Khalifa? Was not Swaraj added on the insistence of the Hindus? In his interview he stated that the 'Hindus are quite welcome to assist their Mussalman brethren in their religious war, but there is no compulsion on them to do so, and they can remain perfectly neutral.' The Mussalmans may actively help a Moslem invader, and if the Hindus join in their holy war, they are, of course, welcome. Otherwise they must remain neutral. If they do not remain neutral but actively assist the Government in repelling the invasion, they are to be treated as enemies. Will the Hindu-Muslim unity then remain indissoluble? All doubts on the point ought to be laid at rest by the following answers given to searching questions put by our representative to Mr. Mohamed Ali:—

Q.—It is not quite clear from the interview read out by me as to what your attitude will be towards those members of the Hindu community who not only do not assist you in the eventuality of a Jihad but on the other hand assist the Government? Will you please enlighten me on this point?

A.—My attitude will depend upon the attitude of those Hindus themselves. If they shoot me I will shoot them.

Q.—I cannot say if they will shoot you, but they will actively assist the Government against invaders.

A.—You mean assist the Government when the Mussalmans fight against the enemies of Islam.

Q.—Yes.

A.—Then you may expect the use of force against them also. Force against force.

Q.—They will be treated as enemies?

A.—Yes, just as the Arabs and other Muslims treated

their own co-religionists from India who fought on behalf of the British Government in Mesopotamia and elsewhere.

Let us analyse what this means. It means that when the Afghans declare a holy war and invade the country, then, if Mr. Mohamed Ali decides actively to help them, the Hindus must quietly allow their motherland to be invaded. If they offer opposition in cooperation with Government they are to be treated as enemies by him and other Indian Mussalmans who may join him in the Jihad. Those who now proclaim themselves as the protagonists of Hindu-Muslim unity will treat the Hindus who may fight for their hearths and homes as their enemies. When the sword of Islam is unsheathed every one must bow to it. Hindus as well as Christian. The Turks and Arabs had every right to fight their co-religionists who invaded their lands as part of a hostile force. But how the Indian Mahomedans will be justified in declaring war against the Hindus if they attempt to repel the attacks of an external power passes our understanding. On the contrary according to the analogy cited by Mr. Mohamed Ali himself, both the Mahomedans and Hindus should combine to resist the invasion of India by the Afghans, Turks, or Bolsheviks, just as the Arabs and Turks fought against Indian Mussalman soldiers when they invaded their land. The nationalism of Mr. Mohamad Ali is very thin indeed, and a little scratching showed that he is a fanatical Mahomedan to the core and that he will have no hesitation in treating the Hindus, whom he claims as his brethren, as his enemies if they resist external Moslem aggression through patriotic motives, and refuse to betray the interests of India to subserve Muslim interests. The implications of his answer ought to be fully grasped before faith is reposed in his profession of desire to promote Hindu-Muslim unity and to win Swaraj for India. We would not have

attached the importance we have been doing to Mr. Mahomed Ali's Pan-Islamic and anti-Indian views if we had felt sure that they represented only his opinions. But we are afraid he is not alone in holding those views which are shared by a considerable section of his following, and hence we would ask every patriotic Indian to keep his eyes wide-open and not to be swept away by mere emotionalism and craze for Hindu-Muslim unity. The keen desire of the Hindus for such a unity in national interests has been sufficiently exploited by astute Mussalman politicians for their purposes and it is time that there should be some plain speaking. So long as the basis of this unity is not laid on a consuming love of the country, among both the communities, and so long as it derives its sustenance from the hatred of the British, for so long it will rest on insecure foundations and will remain unreal, a source of deception and disappointment and eventual bitterness. Let each of them seek their destiny inside the country and live and die for it alone. Let us not in our attempt to deceive or hoodwink others deceive ourselves into believing things which are not and build our hopes on quicksand.

Mr. Mohamed Ali declared that if 'any Muslim power proclaimed a Jihad and having defeated the present Government, wanted to settle down in India as its rulers. It will be my duty to oust such rulers from India using every means allowed to me by my faith.' First of all he will render assistance to the invading power and then if it succeeds in destroying the present Government and wants to rule over India, Mr. Mohamed Ali will oust it. Even the most credulous will refuse to take this assertion seriously. If he cannot turn out the British Government, is it not the sheerest absurdity to say that he will expel their conquerors? Then it should be carefully noted that Mr. Mahomed Ali says



that he will only use those means which are allowed to him by his faith. Is this not extremely ambiguous? Does it not imply that he will not adopt physical force, as a faithful Mahomedan, in expelling the Muslim ruler who may establish his dominion in this country? Will he be prepared to drive out a Muslim ruler with a view to divide power with the Hindus who form the bulk of the population? He asserted that the Afghan bogey is the latest trick of the 'Divide and Rule' jugglers and one more manifestation of slave mentality. No one can be taken in by such a clever attempt to evade the issue. What the Hindus and true nationalists are principally concerned with is not whether the Afghan menace has any substance in it or not, but whether the Ali brothers are first and foremost friends of India or of Afghanistan and Turkey, and whether they care more for the restoration of the Turkish Empire in its pristine glory, or for the uplift of India. And can it be said that with the prolongation of the peace negotiations with Afghanistan for over a year, the conclusion of the Russo-Afghan and Turko-Afghan treaties the terms of which include the supply of arms and ammunition and military help to Afghanistan, and the highly disturbed state of the frontier, that the Afghan menace is imaginary? Mr. Mahomed Ali made it clear that he is not a believer in non-violence as a principle of action. He will stick to it so long as he thinks that it is more effective. But if he thinks that violence will serve the purpose better, he will not hesitate to use and counsel it. For he stated that if the Jihad was declared by the Khalifa himself then he would have no discretion left, but in any other case, "I have full discretion to judge whether the same objective cannot more effectively be gained by other means."

It is wrong to say that the British Government wants

to destroy Islam. Neither the Turks nor the Arabs, who are directly concerned say so. The former are fighting for Smyrna and Thrace and not for the Holy Lands. The latter do not want to be brought under the rule of Turkey. It is specially in India that the cry of religious persecution has been raised and efforts have been made to arouse fanaticism and to appeal to religious prejudices.

Our own attitude about the Turkish question is well-known. We do not desire any of the Muslim countries to be brought under the domination of British Imperialism. They should be allowed a free and unfettered existence as far as possible. We approach the question from the point of view of national freedom and not of religion. And in our criticism of Mr. Mahomed Ali's attitude we are not in the least actuated by any anti-Muslim feeling. If it is his 'mission in life to remove every source of friction that exists between Hindus and Mussalmans, so that the two united may achieve their liberation jointly', then he is a true nationalist and we are at one with him. Let him fight as much for the Khilafat as he likes, but if he desires that Hindus should have faith in him, he should unequivocally declare that under no circumstances will he actively help the Afghans or any other outside power to invade India. Let us fight out our national battle with the British Government without external intervention which, from the very nature of things, cannot be disinterested, and may, if successful, make the position of India infinitely worse instead of better.

---'The Leader' 13-5-21



## VI

## 'MADRAS MAIL' ON MAHOMED ALI

Mr. Mahomed Ali's attempt to explain and justify his Erode speech with its invitations to Afghanistan to invade India and assuring the Amir of an openhanded welcome should he do so, is the boldest attempt to impose on the credulity of a people we have ever seen. His explanation is a series of 'If's.' He declares :—' If the Amir fights the enemies of Islam he has my support ; if he fights the present Government of India because they are turbulent neighbours, he has my entire sympathy, and he can free Afghanistan from fear by the liberation of India. But I certainly do not invite him to liberate India for the sake of India's liberation.' What does this all mean ? Let us analyse it. Mr. Mahomed Ali will support Afghanistan if she fights the enemies of Islam. Does he regard the Government of India, with their Indian and Mahomedan elements, as enemies of Islam ? If not, why include this reference in the justification of his invitation to the Amir to invade India ? If he does, he must know in his heart that he is wrong, and that he is creating a false impression among his coreligionists. No Government has done more than the Government of India to help Islam. None, not even the Turkish Government has done more to ensure the safeguarding of its interests, and all unbiassed Muslims must admit this to be true. Why then seek to imply that the Government of India are enemies of Islam ? There can be no other reason than that Mahomed Ali desires by suggestions to pervert the minds of Muslims.

Let us look at the next reason. Mahomed Ali declares that if Afghanistan fights the present Government of India because they are turbulent neighbours, she has his sympathy. India, a turbulent neighbour ! The very suggestion is enough to make the gods shriek about with mirth.

Peaceful, unwarlike India, whose politicians and administrators are seeking by every means to lessen her armed forces whose army has already been substantially reduced, a turbulent neighbour ! One might as well accuse a sloth of being over-active. India, who has ever sought to live in peace, whose greatest burden has been the effort to quieten her factious neighbours on her north-west frontier, accused of being turbulent ! What a suggestion !

But see the subtle enemy of his country in Mahomed Ali's next remark. The Amir can free Afghanistan from fear by the liberation of India, though, adds the pious hypocrite. " I do not invite him to liberate India for the sake of India's liberation." In other words Mahomed Ali tells the Amir ; ' invade India, lay her fair cities in the dust, spread carnage and desolation throughout her countryside, overthrow the power which has preserved peace in the country for a century and a half, and has led the people from discord to harmony and prosperity ; do this and you will be freed of a powerful neighbour, your banners will wave over India, her riches will be yours, her men your servants, her women your slaves. No longer need you fear the arm of the law, for the guardian thereof will be in the dust, we will not resist you, we will help you by obstructing those who would oppose you. But please, when you come, do not say that you have come to liberate India for the sake of India's liberation. Speak the truth and say that you have come to remove a power you feared, a restraint which vexed you, and thwarted our plans.' And having thus invited the invader, Mahomed Ali proceeds, with his tongue in his cheek, to say that the liberation of India is his task and that of his Hindu compatriots. It would be, provided indignant India allowed him to live to help therein. It would be his task, and India's to throw back the invader, to restore peace and order in this vast

country, violated at the invitation of Mahomed Ali, Gandhi and their friends.

Does loyal India fully realise the danger which confronts her as a result of these wild speeches? Non-co-operation logic cannot explain them away, it only reveals them in all their blackness as the despicable utterances of traitors to their motherland. Moreover, such as this needs no explanation. It is revealed in every sentence uttered by those guilty of it. And it is for loyal Indians and especially loyal Muslims to repudiate those who, while pretending to be friends of the country, are its worst enemies. Does the vast majority of Indians wish the Amir of Afghanistan to invade their country? If not, let them declare by every means in their power, that they do not, and that they will support the Government in every measure designed to keep her frontiers unviolated. That is the predominating issue at the present moment. Non-co-operation leaders are inviting invasion. Having failed to convince the nation of the value of their creed, and seeing the year they allowed for the introduction of Swaraj rapidly passing, they seek to obtain their object by fomenting unrest and revolution in India and by inviting invasion from over the border. They care not who rules India so long as it is not the British nation. Afghanistan and Bolsheviks, bloodshed and terrorism, are more welcome to their disordered minds than the peace of constitutional Government. But what does India want? Peace or the sword?



## VII

## THE ALLEGED AFGHAN SPY

Simla, May 14.

With reference to the article published by Swami Shraddhanand regarding the visit of the alleged Afghan spy to Pandit Malaviya, the Panditji has made the following statement to an Associated Press representative :—

I have not seen the article published by Swami Shraddhanand in his paper, the *Shraddha*, in the original. But I have seen extracts from it published in the *Pratap* of Lahore and a translation of it in the *New Empire* of Calcutta. It contains misstatements in several important particulars. The facts are these : About a year ago, I think it was a little before the Khilafat Conference met at Allahabad, an Afghan came to me at Benaras. He said he had been sent by some leading persons in Afghanistan, that the Amir Sahib and the leading men of Afghanistan closely watched our fight with the British Government and deeply sympathized with us, that the Afghans were willing to come to India to help us against the British Government, but that they wanted to know whether and how far in my opinion the Hindus of this country would support the Afghans if they came to fight the British Government. I felt doubt as to whether the man was a genuine messenger from Afghanistan or a spy sent by somebody here to draw me out. But taking him at his word, I said to him that I was thankful to those who had sent him for their sympathy towards us, that I too had a deep sympathy with Afghanistan, that we were endeavouring in our own way to obtain freedom and that I sincerely desired Afghanistan to preserve its independence and not to risk it in an attempt to help us against

the British Government. I told him further that though we had many grievances under the British Government, yet if the Afghans would invade India, in my opinion, every Hindu and the great bulk of Mahomedans who count and every Indian State without any exception would array themselves on the side of the British Government to repel the invasion, that with the combined resources of England and India in men and money, the British Government would easily, be able to defeat the Afghans; that there was already a party among the British Officers who had long advocated that the British Government should establish its domination over Kabul; and that if a war took place the counsels of this party would gain ascendance and that would mean a real danger to Afghanistan. I asked that gentleman what the probable period of war was as calculated by the Afghans and for which they had collected treasury, munition, and provisions of food. His answer was 'for about six months.' I told him that from the information I had I believe that the British Indian Government was prepared for a war lasting, if necessary, for several years. I told him that from every conceivable point of view it would be a national crime and folly on the part of the Afghan Government to enter upon a war with the British Government and to help us, and that the only result which I could foresee would be an appalling loss of life and treasure on both sides, with no advantage to India but with the probable loss of the independence of Afghanistan. I, therefore, told him in conclusion to tell the gentlemen who had done me the honour of sending him to me for my opinion that they should absolutely abandon the idea of an Afghan invasion of India if they really seriously entertained it. The gentleman thanked me for what he appreciated as a candid opinion and said that he would go back soon to Afghanistan and would communicate it to those who had

deputed him. Even after he had left I did not feel sure whether he was a genuine messenger from Afghanistan.

Questioned as to the correctness of the statement in the article that to put off the Afghan emissary the Pandit had referred him to Mr. Gandhi, the Pandit unhesitatingly replied that it was entirely untrue, and proceeding, said: "Nor did I hear that the Afghan went to Mahatma Gandhi or to Mr. Mohamed Ali. I might add that after the man went away I did not give any serious thought to this incident."

Our representative further asked: "Did you mention it to anybody?" The Pandit replied that he mentioned it for what it might be worth on different occasions to three or four friends.

Q.—Was Dr. Sapru one of them?

A.—No; he was not among those. I never mentioned this incident to him nor did he ever ask me anything about it or about the allegation made against Mr. Mohamed Ali in the story which Swami Shraddhanand was told until four days ago when we both noted the telegram of Mr. Mohamed Ali to Swami Shraddhanand published in papers.

In conclusion our representative asked:—There is much talking on just now of a possible invasion of India. Do you still hold the opinion which you expressed to the Afghan emissary?

Panditji.—Yes, I do even more firmly than before.



## VIII

### MR. ABUL KALAM AZAD'S VIEWS

Calcutta, June 1.

Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad has sent a long article to the press regarding the Afghan Bogey and the alleged



Afghan attack on India, in the course of which he says that during the last two weeks he received a good number of letters asking him to give out the Islamic views frankly on the above question. The Maulana says :—There are only four different circumstances under which India can be attacked from outside.

“ Firstly, the present circumstances, under which the British Government is ruling over us against our will and holding us as slaves. In this case, any attack directed against India will not be against the country and ourselves but against the British Government, and as that Government has established its rule over the Islamic countries and is fighting against the Khilafat no Mahomedan under any Islamic law has any obligation to side with it.

Secondly, when Swaraj is attained and a united Government of Hindus and Mahomedans established, every Mahomedan in order to protect his and his country's freedom is religiously bound to resist the attack directed against India, even though the attackers may be Mahomedans and not to give a single inch of ground so long as a single Mahomedan is alive in India.

Thirdly, where one of the Powers which have been fighting against Islam and the Khilafat attacks India, for instance, if France enters into war with the British, in such a case every Mahomedan is religiously bound to adopt an attitude of strict neutrality.

Fourthly, when any such power attacks India as to convince Mahomedans that victory of such a power will still more destroy the freedom of the country and the Islamic principles than what the British rule has done in India, Islam will then allow the Mahomedans to side with the British only as long as such an enemy has not been beaten.

Regarding the Afghan Bogey the Maulana thinks that the man who saw Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya at Benares was not from Kabul but from India itself and was sent by Maulvi Niamatullah, the chief of the old Indian Mujahideens of Bunair, in the N. W. Frontier. The Maulana says, that in March 1920 this man saw him too in Bombay when he (the Maulana) was there for the Congress and Khilafat conferences just after his release from internment. The man was posing as coming from Kabul simply to attach an undue importance to his position, but in fact, he had no connection with the Kabul Darbar. He expressed his desire to be introduced to the late Mr. Tilak, Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and Lala Harkishen Lal, but then the Maulana did not think the matter to be of such consequence as to claim any attention and told the man that it was useless and nonsense. The Maulana thinks that the same man saw Pandit Malaviya too in Benares. The Ali brothers knew nothing about it nor did he (the Maulana) think it necessary to relate the incident to Mahatma Gandhi.



## IX

### MR. LAJPAT RAI ON AFGHAN BOGEY

Lahore, June 1.

In his concluding signed article in the *Bande Matram* on the Afghan Bogey, Lala Lajpat Rai writes :—The Hindu-Muslim relation ( friendship ) should be so firm and consolidated that the Hindus should prefer Muslims to all other nations in the world and, similarly, Indian Musalmans should prefer Hindus to all others, be they Muslim or non-Muslim. He has no reason to doubt that Muslim nationalists do not desire the Amir's rule in India. The duty of the Hindus is clear in this matter. So far as they believe in the principle of non-co-opera-

Apparently, the Afghan authorities are prepared to include among ambassadorial functions certain duties which are generally called by a less polite name.

—'The Leader' 2-6-21



## XII

A. I. C. C. July, 1921.

### CONGRESS FOREIGN POLICY

That the following resolution passed at a public meeting of the citizens of Bombay held on the 26th April 1921 under the auspices of the Central Khilafat Committee of India be recorded :—

" In view of the fact that the destiny of the people of India is inevitably linked with that of the neighbouring Asiatic Nations and powers, this public meeting of the Mussulmans of Bombay request the All India Congress Committee to promote feelings of amity and concord with neighbouring States, and with a view to establish mutual good-will and sympathy, to formulate a clear and definite foreign policy for India ."

Resolved further that the grateful acknowledgements of the All India Congress Committee be communicated to Mr. Pickthall, the Chairman of the said meeting, and to the Central Khilafat Committee of India for inviting the attention of the All India Congress Committee to a matter of such importance, and that the Working Committee be asked to frame a statement of such policy for presenting the same at the next meeting of the All India Congress Committee for its consideration.

WORKING COMMITTEE, OCTOBER, 1921.

With reference to the resolution on foreign policy

referred specially by the All India Congress Committee held at Bombay in July last to the Working Committee the latter is of opinion that the Congress should let it be known to the neighbouring and other states :—

1. That the Government of India in no way represent Indian opinion and that their policy has been traditionally guided by considerations more of holding India under subjection than of protecting her borders ;

2. That India as a self-governing country can have nothing to fear from the neighbouring states or any state as her people have no designs upon any of them and hence no intention of establishing any trade relations hostile to or not desired by the peoples of such states ;

3. And that the people of India regard most treaties entered into with the Imperial Government by neighbouring states as mainly designed by the latter to perpetuate the exploitation of India by the Imperial power, and would therefore urge the states, having no illwill against the people of India and having no desire to injure her interests, to refrain from entering into any treaty with the Imperial power.

The Committee wishes also to assure the Mussalman states that when India has attained self-government, her foreign policy will naturally be always guided so as to respect the religious obligations imposed upon Mussalmans by Islam.

Whilst such is the view of the working Committee on foreign policy, the committee is unwilling to let it go forth as the opinion of the All India Congress Committee without its being fully discussed by the public and adopted at a meeting of the latter.



## XIII

## THE MENACE OF MUSLIM RAJ

## THE LATE DR. ANNIE BESANT'S VIEW

[ The following is an extract taken from Dr. Annie Besant's "Future of Indian Politics" published in 1922 ( pp. 301 to 304 ). ]

" Another serious question arises with regard to the Mahomedans of India. If the relation between Muslims and Hindus were as it was in the Lucknow days, this question would not be so urgent though it would even then have almost certainly arisen, sooner or later, in an Independent India. But since the Khilafat agitation, things have changed and it has been one of the many injuries inflicted on India by the encouragement of the Khilafat crusade, that the inner Muslim feeling of hatred against "unbelievers" has sprung up, naked and unashamed, as in years gone by. We have seen revived, as guide in practical politics, the old Muslim religion of the sword ; we have seen the dragging out of centuries of forgetfulness of the old exclusiveness claiming the Jaziratul-Arab-the island of Arabia as a holy land which may not be trodden by the polluting foot of a non-Muslim ; we have heard Muslim leaders declare that if the Afghans invaded India, they would join their fellow-believers, and would slay the Hindus who defended their Motherland against the foe ; we have been forced to see that the primary allegiance of Mussalmans is to Islamic countries, not to our Motherland ; we have learned that their dearest hope is to establish the " Kingdom of God," not God as Father of the world, loving all his creatures, but as a God seen through Mussalman spectacles, resembling in his command through one of the prophets, as to the treatment of unbelievers the Mosaic *JHVH* of the early Hebrews, when

they were fighting as did the early Muslims, for freedom to follow the religion given to them by their prophet. The world has gone beyond such so-called theocracies, in which God's commands are given through man. The claim now put forward by Mussalman leaders that they must obey the laws of their particular prophet above the laws of the State in which they live, is subversive of civic order and the stability of the State; it makes them bad citizens, for their centre of allegiance is outside the Nation and they cannot, while they hold the views proclaimed by Maulanas Mahommed Ali and Shaukat Ali, to name the most prominent of these Muslim leaders, be trusted by their fellow citizens. If India were independent the Muslim part of the population—for the ignorant masses would follow those who appealed to them in the name of their prophet—would become an immediate peril to India's freedom. Allying themselves with Afghanistan, Baluchistan, Persia, Iraq, Arabia, Turkey and Egypt, and with such of the tribes of Central Asia who are Mussalmans, they would rise to place India under the Rule of Islam, those in (now) "British India" being helped by the Muslim Indian states and would establish Mussalman rule. We had thought that Indian Mussalmans were loyal to their Motherland, and indeed, we still hope that some of the educated class might strive to prevent such a Mussalman rising; but they are too few for effective resistance and would be murdered as apostates. Malabar has taught us what Islamic rule still means, and we do not want to see another specimen of the "Khilafat Raj" in India. How much sympathy with the Moplas is felt by Muslims outside Malabar has been proved by the defence raised for them by their fellow-believers, and by Mr. Gandhi himself, who stated that they had acted as they believed that their religion taught them to act. I fear that that is true; but there is no place in a civilised land for

people who believe that their religion teaches them to murder, rob, rape, burn, or drive away out of the country those who refuse to apostatise from their ancestral faiths, except in its schools, under surveillance, or in its gaols. The Thugs believed that their particular form of God commanded them to strangle people—especially travellers with money. Such "Laws of God" cannot be allowed to override the laws of a civilised country, and people living in the twentieth century must either educate people who hold these Middle Age views, or else exile them. Their place is in countries sharing their opinions, where they can still use such arguments against any who differ from them—as indeed, Persia with the Parsis long ago, and the Bahaists in our own time. In fact, Muslim sects are not safe in a country ruled by orthodox Muslims. British rule in India has protected the freedom of all sects: Shiahs, Sunnis, Sufis, Bahaists, live in safety under her sceptre, although it cannot protect any of them from social ostracism, where it is in a minority. Mussalmans are more free under British rule, than in countries where there are Muslim rulers. In thinking of an independent India, the menace of Mahomedan rule has to be considered."



#### XIV

### SOVIET INTRIGUES ON INDIAN FRONTIER

SIR ROBERT HORNE'S LETTER TO M. KRASSIN

London, March 17.

Sir R. Horne in a letter to M. Krassin emphasises that the British Government has long been aware of the Soviet intrigues with a view to overthrow British rule in India, which admittedly was the main object of the recent Soviet policy. Government has the strongest reasons to believe that one of the objects of the Soviet negotiations with Afghanistan

has been to secure facilities for attacks through Afghanistan upon the peace of India and that one of the principal demands of M. Suritz, Russian Envoy to Kabul, has been for a guarantee of safe transport through Afghanistan without delay of a large number of rifles and a large quantity of ammunitions for the frontier tribes on the British side of the border. This is a direct act of hostility towards India. M. Surtiz also communicated with the anti-British tribal leaders and leading Afghans who were implicated, notably Nadir khan, the commander-in-chief. Jamal Pasha and Mahendra Partap have been similarly active and a number of notorious Indian seditionists have been employed by the Bolsheviks for disseminating disloyalty in India and for fomenting anti-British feeling in countries contiguous to India and particularly in Afghanistan. Emissaries have already been despatched through Afghanistan from Tashkent, which is the advanced base for Indian work and M. Suritz has declared that the base must be removed to Kabul as soon as possible. Similarly in order to facilitate the spread of revolutionary teachings in India M. Suritz has endeavoured to secure from the Afghans facilities for the establishment of printing presses in Kabul and indisputably the propaganda in India was to be a prominent function of the consulates, which he aims at establishing at Kandhar, Ghazni and Jalalabad.

The British Government does not object to Afghan-Soviet treaties providing for neighbourly relations and commercial intercourse, but in view of the avowed desire of the Soviet to overthrow British rule in India and the fact that Russia has no possible commercial or other interests in Eastern Afghanistan, the British Government is compelled to regard the proposals of the Soviet Government as purely anti-British measures. Government has also reason to believe that the Soviet is considering a project for action in the



Pamir region and Government must insist upon the cessation of such activities of the Soviet, as it is an essential corollary to the conclusion of any agreement between the two Governments.

—'The Leader' 21-3-21



## XV

### GANDHI'S HATRED FOR TILAK

On January 1st 1920 I went on my usual morning round to the principal leaders. I began with the place where Gandhiji and Malviyaji were putting up. On seeing me Malviyaji at once took me aside and asked me to join himself and Mahatmaji in purging the Congress of its diplomatic and crooked policy. Asked for further particulars, Malaviyaji said that as he and Mahatmaji were not going to the Pandal that day I should also join them as a protest. I took Malaviyaji upstairs and asked Mahatmaji for an explanation. He also re-iterated what Malviyaji had proposed. In reply I said "I am at this moment the host who has invited the Congress and all the delegates are my guests. How can I absent myself?" Mahatma Gandhi admitted the force of my argument but Malviyaji said that after the session was over I might go out of the Congress with them and work for its reform. On this I turned round to Mahatmaji and said, "You advised me to join the Congress in order to spiritualize it. If you intend to work for the reformation of the Congress by remaining inside, I am heart and soul with you, but if you want to secede from the Congress in order to oppose it, I will have nothing to do with it. Mahatmaji again told me that Malviyaji had not grasped his (Mahatmaji's) position. He was not certain that visitors would take no part in voting and his conscience forbade him from taking advantage of catch-votes. I assured Mahatmaji that I would be responsible

for all visitors remaining outside the Pandal as well as for regular counting of votes if there was a division. Mahatmaji was doubtful whether I would succeed in what I promised but Lala Harkishanlal, arriving at this time, assured Mahatmaji that I would be able to accomplish what I promised.

—'The Liberator' 8-7-26



## XVI

### CHANGE IN MUSLIM VIEW-POINT

The first warning was sounded when the question of condemning the Moplas for their atrocities on Hindus came up in the Subjects Committee. The original resolution condemned the Moplahs wholesale for the killing of Hindus and burning of Hindu homes and the forcible conversion to Islam. The Hindu members themselves proposed amendments till it was reduced to condemning only certain individuals who had been guilty of the above crimes. But some of the Muslim leaders could not bear this even. Maulana Fakhir and other Maulanas, of course, opposed the resolution and there was no wonder. But I was surprised when an out and out Nationalist like Maulana Hasrat Mohani opposed the resolution on the ground that as the Mopla country no longer remained Dar-ul-Aman but became Dar-ul-Harab and as they suspected the Hindus of collusion with the British enemies of the Moplahs, therefore the Moplahs were right in presenting the Quran or sword to the Hindus. And if the Hindus became Mussalmans to save themselves from death it was a voluntary change of faith and not forcible conversion. Well, even the harmless resolution condemning some of the Moplahs was not unanimously passed but had to be accepted by a majority of votes only.

There were other indications also shewing that the Mussalmans considered the Congress to be existing on their sufferance and if there was the least attempt to ignore their idiosyncracies the superficial unity would be snapped asunder.

—'The Liberator' 26-8-26



## XVII LET HINDUS LEARN

Colonel Wedgwood spoke in the House of Commons on 30 the July :—

The Mussalman has always been the more virile race, the Hindu has always been the less virile race; the cure for that is that the Hindus should become more virile. We have an instinctive admiration for the virile character of the Musalmans....Let the Hindus learn the lesson. It is well that Pandit Malaviya should train the Hindus in physical exercises and physical drill, should inspire them with a capacity for self-defence, should exterminate that slave mentality and create self-respect. He is not thereby increasing their hatred towards the Mussalmans or their love of massacre to which we have become accustomed in India. I must regard the present disturbances as a calamity delaying the march of freedom, but not destroying hope.... what is possible is that both sides shall begin to respect each other and that they shall learn what we have learned that a man who cannot defend himself is always likely to be in a difficult position.



## XVIII THIS WRETCHED AWARD

### WHAT LED TO PRESENT CONGRESS ATTITUDE

#### PART PLAYED BY AGA KHAN AND ANSARI

What made the Working Committee of the Congress and the Parliamentary Board to adopt the illogical, indecisive and anti-national attitude towards the Communal Award?

From private advices received from London, we are in a position to state that H. H. the Aga Khan has a great deal to do with it.

It was known in England and on the Continent that the Joint Parliamentary Committee, at any rate, some members of it appreciated the injustice done to Hindus and Sikhs by undue pampering of the Muslims and Sir Samuel Hoare informed the Aga Khan that in order to save the Award for the Muslims as it is, he must see that even Congress did not adopt an adverse attitude towards it.

The Aga Khan communicated to Dr. Ansari these developments and it would appear, succeeded in persuading him to give up his former position of complete opposition to Communal Award and adopt the nebulous formula of neither accepting nor rejecting the Award. This explains Dr. Ansari's inspiring the present attitude of the Working Committee and the Parliamentary Board.

We have seen that despite the lukewarm attitude of Congress, the non-Nationalist Muslims have not been won over and they are going to contest Assembly Elections in opposition to Congress.

If the story is true, what a light it throws on Muslim League and Nationalism and the Congress leaders who are wooing it.

The London Correspondent of the 'Daily Sun' wired to that paper on August 16th, that frequent conferences

between the Aga Khan and Mr. Jinnah who is in Europe were taking place.

The subject matter of these conferences was of course the fear that the Joint Parliamentary Committee might say something by way of modifying the Communal Award so as to disfavour the Muslims unless the Muslims stood by the White paper intact.

It may be mentioned here that there is still no candidate for the Muslim seat from Bombay. Mr. Jinnah is still undecided and until Mr. Jinnah decides, the Congress Parliamentary Board also will remain undecided, as he must be accommodated to please Nationalist Muslims.



## XIX

### GANDHI'S TRUTH

#### THE TRAGEDY OF GANDHI

Page 396

Even friends did not willingly believe that no interview had been. Dr. Edward Thompson gained from Mr. Jayakar the admission that he is "elusive." "But there is no doubt that he is capable of the very highest forms of truth." Dr. Thompson himself wrote: "No episode in his whole career had done his reputation graver harm. Unless it is cleared up, he will not be regarded in Continental Europe as a saint again. It was part of the reason why his arrest was taken so quietly in India." Mr. Gandhi is honourable and honest, but he is "elusive." It was the criticism of Indian and English friends alike.



## XX INDIA'S CASE FOR SWARAJ

### GANDHI, NOT A HINDU ?

Page 114

In the concluding speech of the Second Round Table Conference Mr. Ramsey Macdonald, the Chairman said,

I am so glad that my old friend Sir Abdul Qaiyum seconded the resolution. It was a great achievement to get Gandhiji and him together. That is the foretaste of what is going to happen (Applause) when the Muslim and the Hin....

Mahatma Gandhi interjected : "Not Hindu. "

The Chairman said : Mr. Gandhi understands the lapses of the untrained human tongue.

Mahatma Gandhi : I forgive it.

The Chairman : He understands the lapses of untrained human tongue such as mine.

Mussalmans and others (Laughter and applause) join together. I am beginning to pick up Mr. Gandhi's thoughts because he has always told us that you were sections and he comprehended you all.

Mahatma Gandhi : Of course.



